

Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library

BX4705.N5 W586

White, Newport John Davis

MAIN

John Henry Newman



3 9967 00252 8425

ACCESSION NUMBER

56008

SHELF NUMBER

BX 4705.N5
W 586

The Virginia Library
McCormick
Theological Seminary
of the
Presbyterian Church, Chicago
826 Belden Avenue

From

Received

May 1926

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN

BY

NEWPORT J. D. ^{John Davis} WHITE, D.D.

Canon of St. Patrick's and

Archbishop King's Professor in the University of Dublin

MCCORMICK THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY,
CHICAGO

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK AND TORONTO : THE MACMILLAN CO.

1925

ENGLISH THEOLOGIANS

Editors : S. L. OLLARD, M.A., and
W. SPENS, M.A.

Bishop Butler.

By ALBERT E. BAKER, M.A. 4s. 6d. net.

Richard Hooker.

By L. S. THORNTON. 4s. net.

Robert Sanderson:

Chaplain to King Charles the First.

By GEORGE LEWIS, M.A. 6s. net.

The Lady Julian.

By R. H. THOULESS, M.A., PH.D.
4s. 6d. net.

EDITORS' PREFACE

THE object of this series is to make clear, in relation to present knowledge, the work of some well-known English theologians. Often their works remain unread because they are thought to be out of date and useless for the solution of modern problems. Certainly the rise and growth of the science of Biblical Criticism, to name no other development, has made some of their work obsolete ; but, allowing for that, there remains much which is of the very highest value. It remains, however, often unknown because the reader is unaware of it. It is hoped that this series may act as a guide.

When this series was projected in 1918 it attracted the keen interest of the Ven. William Cunningham, Archdeacon of Ely, Fellow of Trinity College, and Honorary Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge ; and he undertook to act as joint editor. Dr. Cunningham did much for it by suggesting subjects and securing contributors, and it was hoped that he would have written for it a book on Frederick Denison Maurice. His lamented death in June, 1919, prevented this, but it is due to the series that his connexion with it should be recorded.

The editors are not responsible for the particular opinions expressed by the several writers in this series. Their part has been to secure that each book, in its method of treatment, conforms broadly to the idea of the series, viz., that the works of the writer (or group of writers) are sufficiently illustrated and their value estimated in the light of our present knowledge.

S. L. OLLARD.
WILL SPENS.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN

INTRODUCTION

IN the case of many authors, especially theologians, it is easy to comply with the maxim of Thomas à Kempis, 'Enquire not, who said this; but attend to what is said.'¹ That is to say, the profit or enjoyment derivable from a book may be quite unaffected by anything that we can learn about the words and deeds of the man who wrote it. *Hamlet*, *Paradise Lost*, Butler's *Analogy*, do not gain or lose by any knowledge we may acquire of the happenings in the lives of Shakespeare, Milton, or Bishop Butler. But John Henry Newman's history and personality—what he was in himself and what he did—are more significant than anything that he wrote. The one work of his that will be read long after the titles only of his other books are known to a few, owes its vitality to the fact that it is a portrait of the man's self, a self-revelation thrown off by a tremendous effort of his whole personality worked up into intense and glowing creativeness.

There were two Newmans. There was, in the first place, Newman the Catholic leader and writer, the man who took the most prominent part in the movement through which the Church of England recovered her Catholic consciousness, the man who did more than any one else to revitalize for the Church of England the article of the Creed, *the holy Catholic Church*. And there was

¹ *Imit.* i. 5.

also Newman the Roman Catholic, the man whose Catholicism was, after a prolonged struggle, mastered by the narrow conception of Unity characteristic of Romanism.

The present book is concerned only with Newman the Catholic, the Anglican divine, the man who affected the trend of Anglican theology more powerfully than anyone since the Reformation.

The life of Newman after October 9, 1845, has no significance for posterity, apart from the value—which is of course considerable—of the writings he produced subsequently to that date. He says himself: ‘From the time that I became a Catholic, of course I have no further history of my religious opinions to narrate. . . . It was like coming into port after a rough sea; and my happiness on that score remains to this day without interruption.’¹

The secure calm of the soul which is indicated in these words is no doubt an inexpressibly precious experience to a man’s self; but it is a private joy with which a stranger doth not intermeddle; it has no practical interest for those that are without. The title itself of the book which has just been quoted, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, supplies an unintentional corroboration of this statement: the *vita* closed on October 9, 1845.

Newman’s dynamic life then ceased to function, and a static life began. What I call his dynamic life was used by God to help forward a marked advance in the evolution of a particular section of the Church, the Body of Christ. The men and women to whom the mutual relations of Anglicanism and Romanism are of vital importance may be regarded as a distinct section of the Church, although they have no separate ecclesiastical existence apart from the Anglican or Roman Commu-

¹ *Apologia*, p. 373.

nion, as the case may be. These people may not be important, if you estimate importance by numbers alone ; but as they stand at the point where two different divisions of the army of God adjoin, they are of extreme importance in the day of battle. And the same is true, no doubt, of any other group which takes up a position of sympathetic intermediary between two large bodies who really are, or ought to be, brothers in arms, though their objectives seem to be different.

Newman's part in the history of the mutual attraction and repulsion of Anglicanism and Romanism is twofold : (1) his positive contribution to the theology of the question, his statement of the Anglican position ; and (2) the materials presented by his case for a study in the psychology of converts to Romanism.

The output of any one of the world's workers is estimated variously according to the fundamental assumptions of the judge. The present work is an attempt to give to Anglican readers an account of Newman as an Anglican divine, or at least as one who seriously affected the attitude of the Anglican Communion towards Romanism, as well as towards popular Protestantism. In such a case is involved the whole question as to what is the nature of the Church. In 1839, Newman viewed the issue between Anglicanism and Romanism thus :—' The Anglican said to the Roman : " There is but One Faith, the Ancient, and you have not kept to it ; " the Roman retorted : " There is but One Church, the Catholic, and you are out of it." ' ¹ It is with the Roman retort that we are mainly concerned when we are considering the case of Newman. No one knew better than he did that

¹ *Apologia*, p. 197.

Rome had not kept to the Ancient Faith ; but his imagination had been so trained that he felt it to be a matter of far more vital importance to be inside the One Church than to be certain that that Church was loyal to the Ancient Faith. Consequently, in dealing with the work of such a one as Newman, it will tend to clearness if we begin by setting forth, as briefly as is possible, the theory of the Church which enables us to regard as idle the Roman retort. The man who believes that a chalked line drawn on the pavement is an insuperable barrier to his progress betrays the fact that he is hypnotized.

The Church, then, is the continuation of the Incarnation, the expression of Christ in the world, His body, that by which His personality comes from time to time into human relationships with mankind, just as the body of any individual man is that by which his personality has dealings in the material sphere with other men.

This is involved in St. Paul's statement that the Church is ' the fulness (*pleroma*, content) of Him who all in all is being fulfilled.' ¹ If the Church, then, is the visible, tangible expression in human society of what can be seen from time to time of the process of the working out of God's purpose, if the Church is the body of Christ in the various stages of its growth, then plainly the Church is very immature, very young ; for the body of Christ is to incorporate ' all things ' .²

It would appear from this that we cannot expect to find in the Church at any one stage of its growth all the features and characteristics which will be apparent in its perfected state. This is a truism ; yet it is often forgotten in the thoughts and words of men as they speak and write about the Catholic Church.

¹ Eph. i. 23.

² Eph. i. 10 ; Col. i. 20.

On the one hand, the Church is a body. The term *body* is suggestive of a oneness that is definite, something which, however immature, is yet cognizable by the senses. On the other hand, the unity of the Church must be a unity which is consistent with an 'infinite variety'. As things now are, the Light of the world is seen refracted in many different rays of varying colour and varying intensity. The convergence of these rays is necessary if one would see the Light in its purity and fulness. The various elements—races, nations, etc.—which from time to time have been brought into the Church express severally various aspects of the Christ, 'broken lights' of the 'Light of the World.'

Newman, in his Anglican days, saw and expressed this aspect of the Church:— 'Just as we say in physics, that "nature abhors a vacuum,"' in the same way, it would almost seem, in moral subjects, that she abhors identity; that is, identity of the narrow, absolute, formal kind, which is not content with that oneness of principle, which corresponds to the unity of physical laws, but would shape everything into one mould. It is a great characteristic in fact of the true system, that it can afford to be thus free and spontaneous, to vary its aspect, to modify, enlarge, and accommodate itself to times and places without loss of principle. Why should not the different ages of the Church with their different characters make up a whole, just as the Church itself in every age is, as St. Paul says, 'many members, yet but one body?'¹

At the same time, the conception of the Church as a body suggests that, however that body may be enriched and endowed with new functions in the course of its

¹ *British Critic*, April 1839, p. 410.

growth, it will have certain constant characteristics essential to the kind of body it is, characteristics implanted at its birth, necessary to the nature and conditions of its life ; and therefore permanent.

Again, some of its characteristics, although present in some degree at all periods of its life, are not all equally in evidence at all stages of its growth ; and it has yet other characteristics which must await the perfection of their development on the day of the Church's consummation when ' the sons of God will be revealed.'

Meanwhile, it is natural to ask, Where is the Body of Christ at this present moment in human society ? In other words : what are the necessary elements in the Church, elements the possession of which entitles one group, or some groups, of men to be called the Church, while the title is denied to another group as large or larger, and equally respectable ?

The answer to this question is, speaking broadly, that whatever was essential to the life of the Church in the apostolic age is a necessity of its life in all ages. A full-grown man normally performs functions of which an infant is incapable ; yet what is necessary to the life of an infant does not differ essentially from that which supports the life of an adult.

The following passages from the *British Critic* article already referred to are pertinent here :—

' As to these [essential] points let the age acknowledge and submit itself to these in proportion as it can enter into them with heart and reality : in proportion as the reception of them would be, in its case, the natural development of Church principles.' ¹

¹ p. 411.

‘ We cannot but think that different schools of theology were meant to rise up from time to time in the Christian world according as change was wanted, nay in order to bring out, and give fulness and expression to the truth itself ; the inward basis and substance of truth in doctrine and discipline of course continuing the same all along.’ ¹

‘ In going back to antiquity, they do not wish to force men upon bare, literal, actual antiquity in points unessential ; upon antiquity exactly as it was when ancient times were modern.’ ²

To make an appeal to one particular short period of the Church’s life, and that, too, the earliest period, may seem, perhaps inconsistent with the stress that has been laid on the practical importance of the conception of the infinite expansion of the Church. But it is not so in fact. We must not always think of life in terms of time. The oscillations of the pendulum, or the apparent movements of the heavenly bodies, are useful in the computation of time for the daily round of human occupations ; but periods of time computed equal in this way are by no means equal when you introduce the condition of growth into the comparison of them one with another. The first five years of actual life are, in this sense, longer than the years between the ages of thirty and fifty.

In like manner, the few years between the resurrection of Jesus and the death of St. John the Apostle were, as regards the development of the Church, as long as all the subsequent centuries put together. Those initial years were a creative epoch. Let us keep steadily before us the idea expressed in the phrase ‘ the Body of Christ.’ The Apostolic Church, then, may be compared

¹ p. 412.

² p. 416.

to the body of a newborn infant, a complete, though immature, human being. If the physical body be defective at birth, no prolongation of life can supply, or make up for, the congenital deficiency.

To be explicit, vital union with the living Christ is that in which the life of the Church consists. We have seen that the Incarnation of God in Christ is the great world sacrament. That which is the continuation of the Incarnation, the Church, as the body of Christ, is similarly sacramental in its mode of existence, and the life of each of the members of that body is sacramentally maintained. And so we find, from the earliest times, as essential institutions in the Church (1) the divinely commissioned ministry; and (2) the sacraments of the new Birth and of spiritual nutriment. These are the sacramental assurances of the presence of Christ in the Church. 'Wherever Jesus may be, there is the Catholic Church.'¹

If we thus 'hold fast the Head,' we shall be the better able to form a just judgement as to the body. Varying the metaphor, we may say that the Roman communion is, no doubt, a very extensive province of the Kingdom of God on earth. But spiritual kingdoms are not measured by material standards—so many million square miles, so many millions of population—the importance of a province in a spiritual kingdom is estimated by the value of its contribution to the spiritual wealth of the whole kingdom.

We have not space now to enter upon a conjectural readjustment of the values of the various communions into which those who profess and call themselves Christians are divided. But it is pertinent to observe that so far from Romanism being equivalent to Catholi-

¹ Ignatius, *Ad Smyrnaeos*, 8.

cism (assuming that the Catholic Church is the Church of Christ), Romanism in practice so narrows and perverts Christianity as to constitute a serious obstacle to Christ's drawing men unto Himself.

The Catholic Church is a visible Church. This is granted ; it cannot exist without organization, institutions, doctrinal definitions, regulations. These things are necessary ; but, essentially, they are material means to spiritual ends ; and the age-long characteristic of Rome is over-emphasis on the material and outward. All that is outward and visible in the system of the Church has its most thorough and uncompromising expression in Rome. This tendency has always led Rome to forget our Lord's declaration, ' My kingdom is not of this world.' Worldliness is, unfortunately, a snare into which official spiritual persons of every communion frequently fall ; Bishops, Priests and Deacons in the Anglican Communion are sometimes unpleasantly worldly ; but their worldliness is a private vice. On the other hand, while there are, perhaps, in the ministry of the Church of Rome a larger proportion of unworldly individuals than in the ministry of other communions, the Church system of Rome itself, the organized hierarchy, is to an extraordinary degree greedy of earthly power, unscrupulous as to the means of gaining it, and tyrannical in the exercise of it.

Romanism is in religion what Prussianism is in secular politics ; it is animated by an instinct for domination over the bodies of men through their souls, which imposes itself as a religious object on its agents—often the humblest and most unselfish of men.

Now it was the institutional aspect of the Church that loomed largest in Newman's imagination ; and it was the undoubted fact that this is exhibited in the Church of

Rome more fully, logically and enthusiastically than in any other branch of the Church, that quite naturally determined Newman to submit to claims which were rejected by another side of his brain.

I have thought it necessary to say so much at the outset in order to indicate the point from which I desire to draw my portrait of Newman and his work. The portrait may be, and doubtless will be, wholly inadequate and unsatisfying; yet if 'the values' in it are consistent, the picture will be more intelligible than if these had not been given.

The materials for a life of Newman are most abundant. He took good care that they should be. I do not suppose that Newman wrote more letters or longer letters than men in a similar position who were his contemporaries; but he certainly was at great pains to preserve them and the letters of his correspondents. Newman held that 'the true life of a man is in his letters.' Before he died he made provision for their publication; and he also prepared a memoir of his own life to June, 1830, written in the third person, to supply a connecting link for the better ordering and interpretation of the letters. He also fully recognized that October 9, 1845—the date of his joining the Roman Church—marked the end of one life and the beginning of another. Consequently, the letters written before that date and the autobiographical memoir, were, by his arrangement, edited by a member of the Church of England, Miss Anne Mozley, while the correspondence of his Roman Catholic life was eventually published by Mr. Wilfrid Ward, the distinguished son of a remarkable man, William George Ward, who had been for a time one of Newman's disciples, but later became one of his sternest Roman Catholic opponents.

More important even than the private correspondence is the *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (published 1864) which was elicited by Charles Kingsley's public attack on Dr. Newman's sincerity. It is not within the scope of this book to enter into the details of that controversy. It is sufficient to say that Kingsley was honestly incapable of understanding the subtle processes of Newman's mind. Where Newman could perceive several distinct shades of blue, Kingsley saw only one colour, blue or green. And the publication of the *Apologia* convinced the vast majority of readers that, whether they agreed with Newman or not, he was perfectly sincere. In addition to these primary sources, there is much historical information about Newman in the published lives and correspondence of Pusey, Mozley, and other men of that age, and in the various memoirs dealing with the Oxford Movement written by men who took part in it, especially the great work of R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's.

In this book the *Apologia* is quoted from the first edition. References to Newman's other works are made to the last editions. Miss Anne Mozley's edition of the Letters and Correspondence is cited as *Mozley*.

CHAPTER I

ENVIRONMENT

IT is a truism to say that every man, no matter how profoundly he may influence his own and subsequent ages, is himself very much the product of the age in which he was born and of the environment in which he has grown up. Let us now endeavour to indicate some of the main features of the England of 1801, the year of Newman's birth.

An epoch of revolution was in progress ; but I do not find in Newman's works or in the record of his life, any direct trace of the industrial change that had come over England since the middle of the eighteenth century. The social and economic problems which were then coming to the birth do not seem to have had any existence for him. He was, however, profoundly moved with alarm and repulsion by the new currents of thought which had been generated by changing social and political conditions, which he and his friends summed up in the term Liberalism. To this I shall return later. It was the feared consequences to the Church of England of this so-called Liberalism that chiefly occupied Newman's mind. The Church of God in England was to Newman the most precious thing in the world ; and his general outlook on life and the purpose of his own life will be estimated variously according to the value set by men on the Church of England.

Speaking broadly, by the end of the eighteenth century the spirit of Erastianism had almost destroyed the note

of Catholicity in the English Church. It is quite possible to explain the Royal Supremacy, affirmed at the English Reformation, as an expression, the only one then possible, of the rightful claims of the laity in the Church regarded as an institution. But under the Hanoverian dynasty, with their Lutheran traditions, the element of Erastianism in Church life which is necessary, if limited in amount, asserted itself more and more ; and at the same time the spiritual life of the Church became more and more feeble. The forms of Catholic life were there, alive in print if dormant in action ; but that which moved and spoke was Erastianism.

In the early nineteenth century, the Church of England was, broadly speaking, not an attractive or inspiring institution. Readers of Jane Austen's novels will recall the figures of Mr. Collins and Mr. Elton. That was the age in which they flourished. Here and there, a few traces still survived of the vigorous practising Churchmanship of the days of good Queen Anne, when the Book of Common Prayer really corresponded to the daily devotional life of a considerable proportion of Church people. But in 1801 the vast majority of the clergy took lightly such of their responsibilities as they understood.

Bishop Stubbs, of Chester and Oxford, used to quote in humorous justification of his own alleged physical stationariness as a diocesan bishop, ' Rightly to be great is not to stir without great argument.' This sort of greatness the Church of England did possess. There was learning and there was piety, but no *movement* ; the services and the sacraments of the Church were there, (and they were held in veneration) for such as were moved to come to them. But the emotional element in religion was discouraged as suitable only to Methodists

and Papists. On the other hand, it must never be forgotten that the eighteenth century English Church produced some theologians and thinkers whose works are of permanent value : Berkeley, Butler, Law, Waterland and perhaps Paley.

What has been said refers chiefly to that large section of the Church public which consisted of those who took religion at the value assigned to it by 'the man in the street' of the time, to which must be added those who inherited the name but not the life of the old High Church party.

On the other hand, there was the great Evangelical school, which derived its strength and its weakness from its source, Methodism. 'It had not been unfruitful, especially in public results. It had led Howard and Elizabeth Fry to assail the brutalities of the prisons. It had led Clarkson and Wilberforce to overthrow the slave trade, and ultimately slavery itself. It had created great Missionary Societies.' (R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement*, p. 12f) ; the C. M. S. was founded in 1800. But Evangelicalism had limitations, intellectual and other. In particular, its life and activities in relation to the Church were not based on any theory about the Church as an institution such as could afford a rallying ground for the defenders of it, or even be intelligible to outsiders, whether indifferent or hostile.

In the country parts, the Church was a powerful social force ; but in the large towns it had become positively unpopular. The days were long past when, as in 1710, a Dr. Sacheverell could rouse the passions of a London mob in favour of the Church. The upgrowth of large and densely populated industrial centres in the Midlands and the North from about the middle of the eighteenth century, had not been met by the Church with any

corresponding activity. This failure in perception and initiative must be ascribed to the anæmic condition of the Church under the Georges. In Queen Anne's reign the expansion of London had been met by a Parliamentary grant for the building of fifty new Churches. Broadly speaking, the provision and distribution of places of worship and clergymen all over the country was the same in 1800 as it had been in 1600. The results of the Church's inaction have been disastrous beyond human calculation. We have to-day in Great Britain vast aggregations of people who have grown up in hereditary ignorance of the elementary truths of Christianity, and in hereditary antagonism to the Church as a social institution.

The Established Church was not alone to blame for this state of things; though its responsibility was that of him to whom men have committed much. Organized religion, whether Established or Nonconformist, addressed itself, in the towns, only to the respectable and those dependent on the respectable. As far as the Church of England is concerned, the chapels built by the Evangelicals were supported by pew-rents, a financial arrangement which is fatal to a healthy Church life. And all this time the Church of England 'dwelt careless, quiet and secure,' as did the people of Laish, just before the men of Dan fell upon them.

This was the position when the French Revolution of 1789 percolated, in a diluted form, into England. The people, which had no interest in the past, were acquiring suddenly new powers and privileges, the use of which, naturally, they did not understand, and were looking about for old institutions to pull down. Earl Grey, in 1833, told the bishops to 'set their house in order.' He did not complete the quotation ('for thou shalt die

and not live '); it was not necessary to do so. Arnold, writing in 1832, said, 'The Church, as it now stands, no human power can save.'

As might be expected, the Government sought and found in Ireland a sop to throw to the Cerberus facing them; and the Church Temporalities Act, by which the number of Irish bishoprics was reduced from twenty-two to twelve, received the Royal Assent on August 14, 1833. *Experimentum fiat in corpore vili*, which is, being interpreted, 'Try it on the dog.' The thing had to be done; but the manner and the spirit in which it was done were sinister and alarming in the extreme. The Church was being treated just as though it were a department of the Civil Service in which it was desirable that the staff of clerks should be reduced.

This in fact was the view—purely Erastian—held in all seriousness by those men who controlled public affairs; and it was shared by many who called themselves staunch Churchmen, and these not merely of the laity, but even of the Church authorities.

Indeed the most dangerous malady from which the Church of England was then suffering, and from which it is at no time wholly free, was ignorance of basal Church principles among Church people; and not ignorance alone, but a mental incapacity to attach any meaning to the terms and formulæ in which Church principles are expressed, a congenital mental deficiency comparable to that which prevents many otherwise intelligent persons from a comprehension of the terms and formulæ familiar to mathematicians.

In the thought atmosphere outside the Church there had set in two currents which were inimical to its interests whether temporal or spiritual. These were anti-Toryism in politics and Materialism or Secularism

in religious matters. This latter was what Newman and his friends called Liberalism.

The Clergy of the Church of England were Tories for the most part ; and Toryism had become more and more reactionary. And now the Whigs were at last in office, after about forty years' exclusion from it ; and were not unwilling to use their power for the discomfiture of their political opponents.

The term *Liberal* (and *Liberalism*) which is now most commonly restricted to the political arena, had in Newman's early days a wider reference, and connoted, in his opinion, an attitude of mind corrosive of religious belief. Let us hear his own definition of it (*Apologia*, Note A, last ed., p. 493) :—

‘ By Liberalism I mean false liberty of thought, or the exercise of thought upon matters, in which, from the constitution of the human mind, thought cannot be brought to any successful issue, and therefore is out of place. Amongst such matters are first principles of whatever kind ; and of these the most sacred and momentous are especially to be reckoned the truths of Revelation. Liberalism then is the mistake of subjecting to human judgment those revealed doctrines which are in their nature beyond and independent of it, and of claiming to determine on intrinsic grounds the truth and value of propositions which rest for their reception simply on the external authority of the Divine Word.’

We have come to realize more generally and more fully than was perhaps possible in Newman's early life, that the revelation of God in Christ does not rest simply or wholly on any external authority. The revelation is given from above ; but it can only be given to men who have been prepared to receive it. The authority on which revealed doctrines rest is thus twofold, internal as

well as external, the free recognition by man of the voice of God ; the Divine Word, in effect, does not speak to those who have not ears to hear.

The danger for Christianity of this Liberalism, which is now called the Modern Spirit, was early perceived by Newman, and he never lost sight of it. Indeed it may be said with truth that the one purpose which made a consistent unity of Newman's varied life experiences was his resolve to champion the Revelation of Christ against every attack of Liberalism. Readers of the *Lyra Apostolica* will remember his fierce indictment :—

Ye cannot halve the gospel of God's grace ;
Men of presumptuous heart ! I know you well.
Ye are of those who plan that we should dwell,
Each in his tranquil home and holy place :
Seeing the Word refines all natures rude,
And tames the stirrings of the multitude.

And ye have caught some echoes of its lore,
As heralded amid the joyous choirs ;
Ye heard it speak of peace, chastised desires,
Good-will and mercy,—and ye heard no more :
But, as for zeal and quick-eyed sanctity,
And the dread depths of grace, ye pass them by.

And so ye halve the Truth ; for ye in heart,
At best are doubters whether it be true—
The theme discarding, as unmeet for you,
Statesmen or sages. O new-ventured art
Of the ancient Foe !—but what if it extends
O'er our own camp, and rules amid our friends ?

CHAPTER II

EARLY DAYS

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN was born on February 21, 1801, in Old Broad Street, in the city of London. His father, John Newman, was a banker, whose family belonged to Cambridgeshire; and his mother, Jemima Fourdrinier, belonged to a well-known Huguenot family, settled in England since 1720.

John Henry was the eldest of six children. The second son, Charles Robert, died in 1884, and the youngest, Francis William (1805-1897), became Professor of Latin in University College, London. Of Newman's sisters the eldest, Harriet Elizabeth, married Thomas Mozley (1806-1893), brother of the more celebrated James Bowling Mozley (1813-1878), who became in 1871, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford; the second, Jemima, married another brother, John Mozley; and the youngest, Mary Sophia, died young in 1828. Anne Mozley (1809-1891), who edited Newman's Anglican Correspondence, was sister of Thomas, John and J. B. Mozley.

John Henry was sent, on May 1, 1808, to a school at Ealing, 'conducted on the Eton lines' by the Rev. George Nicholas, D.C.L. John was a rather precocious boy, and he supplemented the ordinary school curriculum with original compositions in prose, verse and even in music. In 1815, when he was but fourteen years old, 'he wrote a burlesque opera, composing

tunes for the songs.' These literary and artistic interests occupied time which would have been better spent in play ; and he never, or scarcely ever, took part in any game. Even at that early age 'he took much pains in the matter of style' in his prose compositions. That union of simplicity and strength, of clearness and felicity of phrase, which characterizes everything Newman wrote, was not achieved without infinite pains. Many years later, he thus describes the preparation of his Lectures on Justification :—' I write, I write again : I write a third time in the course of six months. Then I take the third : I literally fill the paper with corrections, so that another person could not read it. I then write it out fair for the printer. I put it by ; I take it up ; I begin to correct again ; it will not do. Alterations multiply, pages are re-written, little lines sneak in and crawl about. The whole page is disfigured ; I write again ; I cannot count how many times this process is repeated.' ¹

But his efforts in originality were less significant than were the influences upon him from without. Speaking of his devotion to Walter Scott, he writes, 'As a boy, in the early summer mornings, I read *Waverley* and *Guy Mannering* in bed when they first came out, before it was time to get up ; and long before that—I think, when I was eight years old—I listened eagerly to the *Lay of the Last Minstrel*, which my mother and aunt were reading aloud.' ² It would, indeed have been strange had the growing lad not been profoundly stirred by the Romantic School of Literature, the spell of which has not yet been wholly banished. Looking back in 1820 he says, 'I used to wish the

¹ Letter of January 29, 1838, *Mozley*, ii, 250.

² *Mozley*, i, 18.

Arabian Tales were true: my imagination ran on unknown influences, on magical powers and talismans. I thought life might be a dream, or I an angel, and all this world deception, my fellow-angels by a playful device, concealing themselves from me, and deceiving me with the semblance of a material world. . . . I was very superstitious, and for some time previous to my conversion (when I was fifteen) used constantly to cross myself on going into the dark.' ¹

The inward change of mind towards God, which Newman always called his 'conversion,' took place 'in the autumn of 1816.' He says, 'A great change of thought took place in me. I fell under the influences of a definite Creed, and received into my intellect impressions of dogma, which, through God's mercy, have never been effaced or obscured.'² The poverty of human language compels us to call this spiritual experience 'conversion'; but conversion, properly speaking, implies a previous life of positive sin, real or supposed. Luther's conversion, for example, called forth the cry of the heart, *O peccata mea*. There was nothing of this sort in Newman's case. It was that the recognition of a personal intimate relationship with God, which in most cases is the result of a gradual awakening, came suddenly to Newman. 'I recollect,' he says, 'in 1815, I believe, thinking that I should like to be virtuous, but not religious. There was something in the latter idea I did not like. Nor did I see the meaning of loving God.'³

The agency employed by God in effecting this change was the personal influence of one of the masters at the Ealing school, the Rev. Walter Mayer, and also books

¹ *Apologia*, p. 56.

² *Ibid.*, p. 58.

³ *Mozley*, i, 22.

and sermons of Calvinistic theology. It is very significant, as exemplifying Newman's egoism, that the one point in these books a recollection of which remained with him was the doctrine of Final Perseverance. 'I received it' he says, 'at once, and believed . . . that I was elected to eternal glory.' This remark is psychologically interesting, because although Newman subsequently rejected the doctrine, his *Apologia* proves how congenial it was to his natural disposition, which was self-centred to an extraordinary degree. Here he says, e.g. 'While I considered myself predestined to salvation, I thought others simply passed over. . . . I only thought of the mercy to myself.' ¹

As exemplifying this abnormal, morbid self-centredness, we may note that many years afterwards, on the death of J. W. Bowden, a lifelong and very dear friend, at the time when Newman was 'shivering on the brink' of a decisive plunge into Romanism, he records, 'I made a note, which runs thus: "I sobbed bitterly over his coffin, to think that he left me still dark as to what the way of truth was, and what I ought to do in order to please God and fulfil His will."' ² The death of his oldest college friend, with whom he had shared joys and sorrows, affected Newman chiefly as being indirectly prejudicial to the salvation of his own soul. That is the point. Newman sincerely believed that it was more profitable to him to gain his own soul than to gain the world. So he was not selfish in the ordinary sense of the term. Self-centredness commonly makes men greedy of material things, rank, preferment, influence, fame. Newman may have cared for these things; but he would not sell his soul to get

¹ *Apologia*, p. 59.

² *Ibid.*, p. 359.

them ; he had none of the qualities of the successful ecclesiastic. In this—his genuine idealism—lies the explanation of his career, and the secret of the abiding attraction of his personality. We must remember, too, that it was the absorbing interest which Newman took in himself, combined with his genius, that made him the leader of a party. Egoism is a quality essential to a party leader ; but it needs to be recommended by genius in the egoist.

The authors who most powerfully affected Newman's growing consciousness were : Thomas Scott, the commentator ; Daniel Wilson (1778–1858), who became Bishop of Calcutta ; Joseph Milner, author of a Church History in which are copious extracts from the early Fathers—a great source of delight—and Newton on the Prophecies. He also read with profit Law's *Serious Call*, an immortal work of a school of thought different from those already mentioned.

Newton's work on the Prophecies convinced Newman 'that the Pope was the Antichrist predicted by Daniel, St. Paul, and St. John.' He adds : 'My imagination was stained by the effects of this doctrine up to the year 1843 ; it had been obliterated from my reason and judgement at an earlier date ; but the thought remained upon me as a sort of false conscience.' ¹

Newman matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford ('a most gentlemanlike College,' his schoolmaster termed it) on December 14, 1816. He was then two months short of sixteen. He did not go into residence till the following June. The first immediate effect of Newman's personal contact with college life was his friendship with John William Bowden, who was exactly three

¹ *Apologia*, p. 63.

years his senior, though a freshman like himself. The two youths became inseparable, and published as joint authors a poem in two cantos, entitled *St. Bartholomew's Eve, A Tale of the Sixteenth Century*, 1821. Bowden became a zealous lay supporter of the Oxford Movement, and was one of the first writers in the *Tracts for the Times*. He died in 1844, an event to which reference has been already made.

On May 18 (Trinity Monday), 1818, Newman was elected to an open scholarship at Trinity College, 'the only academical distinction which fell to his lot during his undergraduate course.' At the final B.A. examination in 1820, 'he utterly broke down' as a result of over-study; and his name only appeared 'in the lower division of the second class of honours' in classics.¹

In 1816, the Newman family had suffered a financial reverse. The bank in which his father was a partner stopped payment, though it paid all its creditors in full within a month. This misfortune, however, does not seem to have affected Newman's prospects, for, in accordance with his father's original ambition for the Bar, he entered Lincoln's Inn in the same year. 'But his failure in the schools making his prospect of rising in a difficult profession doubtful, and his religious views becoming more pronounced, he decided in the course of 1821, with his father's full acquiescence, on taking Orders.'²

It was characteristic of Newman that his unexpected disappointment at the B.A. examination did not daunt him. With splendid audacity he set about reading for a Fellowship at Oriel College, 'at that time the object of ambition of all rising men at Oxford, and attainable only

¹ *Mozley*, i, 45.

² *Ibid.*, i, 47.

by those who had the highest academical pretensions.' He won it on April 12, 1822.

We must now say something of the men whose personalities helped to mould Newman's mind at Oxford.

Edward Hawkins (1789-1882), Fellow of Oriel, 1813, became Vicar of St. Mary's in 1823; and Newman came directly under his influence from about 1822. 'He was the first who taught me to weigh my words, and to be cautious in my statements. He led me to that mode of limiting and clearing my sense in discussion and in controversy, and of distinguishing between cognate ideas, and of obviating mistakes by anticipation, which to my surprise has been since considered, even in quarters friendly to me, to savour of the polemics of Rome.'¹ Under Hawkins' influence the traces of Calvinism that still remained in Newman's mind disappeared, and he accepted the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, and also the principle of Tradition, that is, that 'Scripture was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to prove it, and that, if we would learn doctrine, we must have recourse to the formularies of the Church.'² This is the substance of a University Sermon preached by Hawkins, May 31, 1818; and the subject was treated more fully by him in his Bampton Lectures in 1840. Hawkins, however, did not accompany his pupil on the road to which he seemed to point, and he became a constant opponent of the Oxford Movement.

The society into which the young Fellow now entered was the most brilliant then in Oxford. To his amazement and joyful dismay Newman found himself at once on surname terms with Hawkins, Copleston, Davison,

¹ *Apologia*, p. 65.

² *Ibid.*, p. 66.

Whateley and Keble; though he did not get over his awed shyness of Keble for some years.

Richard Whateley (Fellow of Oriel in 1811) was then the leader of an intellectual coterie at Oriel called the Noetics, the inner circle of a very superior set. Of him Newman says, 'He, emphatically, opened my mind, and taught me to think and to use my reason. . . . What he did for me in point of religious opinion was first to teach me the existence of the Church, as a substantive body or corporation; next to fix in me those anti-Erastian views of Church polity, which were one of the most prominent features of the Tractarian movement.'¹

In Newman's unsigned article on the 'State of Religious Parties,' contributed to the *British Critic*, April, 1839, we read, 'Mr. Newman is believed to have been much indebted to the friendship of Archbishop Whateley.'

To those whose impressions of Whateley are derived from his later career as Archbishop of Dublin, these statements are somewhat astonishing. Newman, who was for some years in daily affectionate intercourse with Whateley, cannot, of course, be mistaken. Later there was a painful estrangement between the two; and Whateley, like Hawkins, was never more than a signpost in relation to the Oxford Movement; his reason indicated to himself and to others the basal assumptions of the Movement; but his will refused to follow. Newman's account of Whateley's views makes it very probable that Whateley was the author of *Letters on the Church, by an Episcopalian* (London, 1826), an anonymous work, the authorship of which Whateley never admitted and never denied. A quotation will show the standpoint of the writer:—'While Jesus Christ . . . claimed no temporal

¹ *Apologia*, pp. 68, 69.

sovereignty. . . . He nevertheless asserted His regal dignity . . . and He delegated authority in this His spiritual empire not to Kings . . . but to Apostles. . . . As my Father hath sent me, etc. : I appoint unto you a Kingdom, etc. ; I have given unto you the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven ; whosoever sins ye remit, etc. ; whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, etc. ; and, lo, I am with you always, etc.'

' I scarcely need remark to you, that these expressions imply not merely a delegation of authority, but also that it was delegated, not to the Apostles alone, as individuals . . . but also to their successors, the bishops and pastors of the Church, whom they, doubtless under the direction of the Holy Spirit, ordained to fill those offices, and who have continued in unbroken succession down to the present day. Nor can it be necessary to reply to the empty cavil, that the force of this uninterrupted succession is destroyed by the series having passed through the Roman Church. . . . It is evident that the misconduct of their predecessors cannot divest them of their right to ordain successors in that authority which was really theirs. If a former King of Great Britain have advanced a groundless claim to the crown of France, this cannot invalidate the right of his descendants, who have renounced that claim, to inherit their own proper dominions.'

' The power of the Church . . . has manifestly no less a claim to be acknowledged of divine origin, than that of the Jewish theocracy ; nor has, consequently, any less title to reverence.' ¹

This book appeared in 1826 ; but in his earlier days at Oriel about 1823, one of his other colleagues, William

¹ Letter iii, on the ' Authority of the Church.'

James, had introduced him to 'the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, in the course of a walk . . . round Christ Church meadow ; I recollect being somewhat impatient on the subject at the time.'¹

About this date Newman read, for the first time, Butler's *Analogy*. This marked an era in the progress of his religious opinions. 'What I most gained from it . . . lay in two points, which . . . are the underlying principle of a great portion of my teaching. First, the very idea of an analogy between the separate works of God leads to the conclusion that the system which is of less importance is economically or sacramentally connected with the more momentous system, and of this conclusion the theory, to which I was inclined as a boy, viz. the unreality of material phenomena, is an ultimate resolution. . . . Secondly, Butler's doctrine that Probability is the guide of life, led me . . . to the question of the logical cogency of Faith.'²

A good many years afterwards Butler's *Analogy* was removed from the Oxford curriculum by the University authorities, just because of Newman's admiration for that truly great book and his acknowledgment of the influence it had on his opinions. This was definitely stated by W. E. Gladstone in a letter of November 10, 1895, to Dr. Bernard, the present Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. He writes, 'I gather . . . that Butler has a recognized place in your University studies. . . . His deposition in Oxford was a cruel act, perhaps the worst determinate result of the great anti-Newman reaction.'³

When Newman became free of the Oriel Common-room, John Keble had already become a venerated

¹ *Apologia*, p. 67.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 67, 68.

³ *Correspondence on Church and Religion*, ii, 337.

personality, though still quite young. He had gained Fellowship in 1811. But, owing probably to the shyness of both men, Newman and Keble did not become intimate till 1828, some years after their official acquaintance had commenced. Keble left Oxford in 1823, in order to act as curate to his father, then in falling health. The two men were eventually brought together by a pupil of Keble's and younger colleague of Newman's, Richard Hurrell Froude. When Froude had his own death in prospect, he said one day, 'Do you know the story of the murderer who had done one good thing in his life? Well, if I was ever asked what good deed I have ever done, I should say I had brought Keble and Newman to understand each other.'¹

Keble's *Christian Year* was published in 1827. He was one of the most saintly characters of that or any other age. Shy and unambitious, he became prominent merely by general recognition of his gifts and character. From Keble's writings and conversation the two main intellectual truths which Newman had learnt from Butler's *Analogy* were again impressed on him. These are: the Sacramental system, and the application to belief of the maxim, 'Probability is the guide of life.'

'The danger of this doctrine,' Newman observes 'in the case of many minds, is its tendency to destroy in them absolute certainty, leading them to consider every conclusion as doubtful, and resolving truth into an opinion, which it is safe to obey or to profess, but not possible to embrace with full internal assent.'

Newman 'considered that Keble met this difficulty by ascribing the firmness of assent which we give to religious doctrine, not to the probabilities which introduced

¹ *Remains*, i, 438; *Apologia*, p. 77.

it, but to the living power of faith and love which accepted it. . . . Thus the argument about Probability, in the matter of religion, became an argument from Personality, which in fact is one form of the argument from Authority. In illustration, Mr. Keble used to quote the words of the Psalm: "I will guide thee with mine *eye*. Be ye not like to horse and mule, etc." This is the very difference, he used to say, between slaves, and friends or children.' ¹ Here we touch the essence of personal religion.

Newman was ordained deacon on June 13, 1824, for the parish of St. Clement's, Oxford. The text of his first sermon was Ps. civ. 23, 'Man goeth forth to his work and to his labour until the evening.' He chose the same verse as the text of the last sermon he preached as an Anglican, September 25, 1843.

¹ *Apologia*, p. 78.

CHAPTER III

PUBLIC LIFE BEGINS 1828-1833

THE year 1828 marks an epoch in Newman's life. To begin with, it was the year of his first great personal sorrow, the death (January 5) after an illness of a few hours, of his youngest sister, Mary. This loss was the inspiration of verses entitled 'Consolations in Bereavement,' beginning, 'Death was full urgent with thee, sister dear.' The last stanza of this poem is more alive with natural human emotion than anything else he ever wrote.

As regards his public life, Newman was now becoming an influential person in Oxford. He was no longer merely being moulded by older men ; younger men were coming into his society to be moulded, in part at least, by him. Edward Bouverie Pusey became a Fellow of Oriel in 1823, Richard Hurrell Froude in 1826, and Robert Isaac Wilberforce in 1828. And Whateley's acute eye, sharpened by political estrangement, 'perhaps saw around me,' Newman notes, 'the signs of an incipient party. . . . And thus we discern the first elements of the movement afterwards called Tractarian.'¹

The year 1828 introduced Newman into a sphere of influence wider than that afforded by a college. In that year Edward Copleston, who had been Provost since 1814, became Bishop of Llandaff and Dean of St. Paul's. For the vacant provostship there were two names before the electors : Hawkins and Keble. Newman supported

¹ *Apologia*, p. 75.

Hawkins, who was elected. In justification of his choice, Newman said, 'with a laugh that, if an angel's place was vacant, he should look toward Keble, but that they were only electing a Provost.'¹ It was, in the event, a fact of great consequence; for Newman now succeeded Hawkins as Vicar of St. Mary's, the University Church. 'Without this,' he wrote many years afterwards, 'there would have been no Movement, no Tracts, no Library of the Fathers.'

Of Newman's younger contemporaries at Oxford the most striking personality was Richard Hurrell Froude, elder brother of James Anthony Froude, the historian. Hurrell Froude was one of those whose early deaths are felt as a trial of faith in God's wisdom; persons who are withdrawn from this sphere of existence before they have had time to accomplish what their friends know they could do. He died in 1836, after four years suffering from consumption. Had he lived, he would in all probability have eclipsed all his contemporaries. This is the impression produced by his *Remains*, published in 1838. It is true that there is in these volumes no finished work that will live; but we find an originality and vivacity and boldness of ideas which must have made him a most stimulating and inspiring comrade; and it is beyond dispute that no other human being exercised on Newman the driving force of Hurrell Froude.

No one knew this better than Newman himself. He acknowledged that in Froude's letters there were 'the first hints of principles, etc., which I and others have pursued.'² And again, 'Mr. Froude, if any one, gained his views from his own mind.'³ Among such 'first

¹ *Mozley*, i, 154.

² Letter of July 16, 1837, *Mozley*, ii, 240.

³ *British Critic*, April, 1839.

hints' are the notion that 'any seemingly indifferent practice of the Church of Rome' may be 'a development of the apostolic ethos'¹ and the inference from the preface to the Articles, that we may 'think nothing of the opinion of their framers.'²

Froude was an aristocratic democrat, one of those whose appetite for revolution is whetted by deliberate reaction from the prejudices of his own class. He was convinced that the Church could only be saved by a thorough democratization, that the notion of a clergyman being necessarily a gentleman in Holy Orders must be completely abandoned. 'We will have,' he writes, 'a *vocabularium apostolicum*, and I will start it with four words; pampered aristocrat, resident gentlemen, smug parsons, *pauperes Christi*.'³

In religious matters, Froude was a theorist, with a constitutional inclination to Romanism; and he made no secret of it. 'He professed openly his admiration of the Church of Rome, and his hatred of the Reformers. . . . He was powerfully drawn to the Medieval Church, but not to the Primitive.'⁴ The publication of his *Remains* in 1838 created a scandal in the strict sense of the term. Newman and the others who were responsible for the publication were not men of the world, and were amazed at the storm raised by their proclaiming on the house-tops of things said in the inner chamber, and then often in irony.

In this same year, 1828, Newman began the regular study of the Fathers; and the picture of the Church which he saw reflected from their pages was a distressing contrast to what he saw of the Church in which he was living. 'I felt,' he says, 'affection for my own

¹ *Remains*, i, 336.

² *Ibid.*, i, 329.

³ *Ibid.*, i, 363.

⁴ *Apologia*, pp. 85-6.

Church, but not tenderness ; I felt dismay at her prospects, anger and scorn at her do-nothing perplexity. I thought that if Liberalism once got a footing within her, it was sure of victory in the event. I saw that Reformation principles were powerless to rescue her. As to leaving her, the thought never crossed my imagination ; still I ever kept before me that there was something greater than the Established Church, and that that was the Church Catholic and Apostolic, set up from the beginning, of which she was but the local presence and the organ. She was nothing, unless she was this. She must be dealt with strongly, or she would be lost. There was need of a second Reformation.’¹

Newman was not the only person who thought that there was need of a second Reformation of the Church of England. Thomas Arnold (1795–1842 ; Fellow of Oriel, 1815) came forward about this time as the champion and militant apostle of undenominationalism. He wanted the term *Church of England* to include every one living in England, except Roman Catholics, Jews, and Atheists. This project of comprehension has had many to favour it ; but as a cure for the sickly condition of the Church it is comparable to the one remedy used for all diseases by Gil Blas’s master ‘le docteur Sangrado,’ viz. bleeding, accompanied by copious draughts of water.

Newman’s growing distrust of Evangelicalism found its earliest public expression in ‘Suggestions in behalf of the Church Missionary Society,’ which he circulated in the University in February 1830. He was at the time one of the Secretaries of the Oxford Branch of the C.M.S. The gist of these ‘Suggestions’ was that inasmuch as

¹ *Apologia*, p. 95.

in the practical working of the Society, Church principles—such as subordination to bishops—were ignored, the clergy should more generally become subscribers to it, and so become members of the Committee; and in that way get control of the management, and so make it in reality a *Church Missionary Society*. This line of action was also advocated by Dr. Hawkins and others. At the same time, while the draft Annual Report was being considered, Newman endeavoured to eliminate from it Evangelical phraseology. It is not surprising that at the Annual Meeting of 1830 he was not re-elected a Secretary.

In 1832, the symptoms of consumption became so apparent in Hurrell Froude that he was ordered to the Mediterranean. His father, Archdeacon Froude, went with him; and Newman, who had been overworking himself, was advised to accompany them. They sailed early in December, and visited Gibraltar, Malta, the Ionian Islands, part of Sicily, Naples and Rome. It was during these travels that most of the poems collected in the *Lyra Apostolica* were written. They appeared monthly in the *British Magazine*. In a letter of December 1, 1832, Newman says, 'We have in contemplation to set up a verse department in *Rose's Magazine* for all right purposes.'¹ It must be remembered that the Newmanites claimed exclusive rights in the epithet *Apostolic*. The *Lyra Apostolica* appeared in 1834; but the Greek motto on the title page reflects the feelings with which Newman and Froude returned to England in 1833. 'We borrowed a Homer, and Froude chose the words in which Achilles, on returning to the battle, says, "You shall know the difference, now that I am back

¹ *Mozley*, i, 281.

again."''¹ This is a very free translation, but it gives the spirit of the line, 'And let them know that I too long have held aloof from war.'

Of the 179 short pieces contained in the *Lyra Apostolica* Newman wrote no fewer than 109. The other contributors were Keble (46), Isaac Williams (9), Froude (8), Bowden (6), and R. I. Wilberforce (1). The most inspired of the collection, 'Lead, kindly light,' so haunting in its mysterious suggestiveness, was written on board an orange boat becalmed in the Straits of Bonifacio, when Newman was going from Palermo to Marseilles in June, 1833, at a time when 'the hand of the Lord was strong upon him.'

This is a suitable place in which to say something about Newman as a poet, especially as the *Lyra Apostolica* contains most of his best poetical work. Of the thirty-two of his pieces reprinted in Palgrave's *Treasury of Sacred Song*, twenty are taken from it; and of the rest, five belong to the same period of his life.

It is sufficient to say that Newman stands in the first rank of writers of religious verse. He wrote one really great hymn, 'Praise to the Holiest in the Height'; and there are a few other pieces which are noble poems because of the intensity of moral and spiritual fervour which must have glowed in the writer as he penned them. But religious verse is almost always consciously didactic, a quality antipathetic to poetry, which is 'simple, sensuous, passionate,' as Milton says. For the most part, Newman wrote English verse as he might have written Latin verses as a school or college exercise. The metre is correct, the language even noble; but the reader feels all the time that the author had one eye on

¹ *Apologia*, p. 98.

the Book of Common Prayer or the Breviary, and the other on the workings of his own soul. God and his own soul were the two objects of Newman's exclusive thought. There are whole continents of human life unexplored, or even unthought of, by him. He had from very early years¹ deliberately shut out of his life the love of woman—a very different thing from acceptance of the adoration of a mother and sisters; he could write playful verses for the albums of young friends; but childhood and youth—if we may judge from his published writings—made little appeal to him; no mystical message came to him from animal life or what we call inanimate nature. But we have no right to complain of the limitations of genius when, as in his case, it is devoted whole-heartedly to one—the highest—cause.

Newman was alone when he wrote 'Lead, kindly light.' He had parted from the Froudes in April; they returned to France, and he went back to Sicily. While there, he was attacked by fever and was dangerously ill. But during the fever's height he kept on exclaiming, 'I shall not die, for I have not sinned against light;' and later he said, 'I have a work to do in England.'² In 1834, the words were remembered as, 'I think God has some work for me.'³ With this conviction strongly calling him, he hurried back to England, and reached London on July 9. On the 14th of the same month Keble preached the assize sermon at Oxford, on 'National Apostacy'; and this was followed a month later by the passing of the Bill for the reduction of the Irish Bishoprics. Newman always dated the birth of the Oxford Movement from the delivery of Keble's famous sermon.

¹ See *Apologia*, p. 63.

² *Apologia*, p. 99.

³ *Mozley*, i, 414.

CHAPTER IV

THE BEGINNING OF THE MOVEMENT

ON July 26, 1833, four men met in conference at Hadleigh Rectory, Suffolk, to lay down the outlines of a practical scheme for the defence of the Church. They were: Hugh James Rose, rector of Hadleigh, William Palmer, the Hon. Arthur Philip Perceval, and Richard Hurrell Froude.

Hugh James Rose (1795-1838) was a distinguished Cambridge man, who had made a great reputation as an apologist and controversialist. He was the founder and first editor (1832) of the *British Magazine*, 'an organ of Church teaching and opinion,'¹ and it was his editorial activities that first brought him into contact with Newman. Although a consistent High Churchman, he did not take a leading part in the Oxford Movement after its initial stages.

William Palmer (1803-1885) was a graduate of Dublin who migrated to Oxford in 1828. His great work on liturgies, *Origines Liturgicae*, appeared in 1832, and at once made him famous in the world of scholars. He too, like Rose, soon became detached from Newman's party. He contributed only one of the *Tracts for the Times*; and when Newman refused to agree to a committee for revision of the tracts before publication, Palmer ceased actively to co-operate in the Movement. In 1843, he published a *Narrative of Events Connected with the Publication of Tracts for the Times*. This may be said to have precipitated the crisis which led to the

¹ Church, *Oxford Movement*, p. 84.

secession of W. G. Ward and Newman, because it led Ward to write and publish his *Ideal of a Christian Church* in 1844. Palmer was described by Newman as the only thoroughly learned man among the originators of the Movement.

The Hon. Arthur Philip Perceval, (1799–1853) had been a student at Oriel College, and subsequently Fellow of All Souls' (1821–1825). He was a Royal Chaplain (1826). He was a voluminous author, but of no great importance. He was a consistent supporter of the Oxford Movement, and on one occasion (July 24, 1838), when preaching as Royal Chaplain at St. James's, he had the courage to advocate High Church principles before Queen Victoria.

The Hadleigh Conference was important, not because it originated anything of much consequence, but because it was the beginning of action of some kind. The only direct result was the formation of an 'Association of Friends of the Church,' 'to rouse the clergy, to inculcate the Apostolical Succession, and to defend the Liturgy.' (Letter of August 31, 1833.)¹

Newman was not present at the Hadleigh Conference; but he began the *Tracts for the Times* 'out of his own head' in September 1833. 'He felt', says Dean Church 'that though associations and addresses [to the Archbishop of Canterbury] might be very well, what the Church and the clergy and the country wanted was plain speaking. . . . The ring of these early Tracts was something very different from anything of the kind yet known in England. They were clear, brief, stern appeals to conscience and reason, sparing of words, utterly without rhetoric, intense in purpose.'²

¹ *Mozley*, i, 448.

² *Oxford Movement*, p. 97f.

Newman's independent action was, in fact, the beginning of the 'little rift within the lute'. Palmer's churchmanship was a fixed stable thing; it was not of the indefinitely expanding kind. He had gone over all the ground of the Roman Controversy in his Dublin days; and he knew far better than his present comrades where Catholicism ends and Romanism begins. He was, besides, a cautious man who desired to move on constitutional lines, by means of an Association with branches all over the country, the whole of which would move at the pace of the slowest member. Newman had no use for an association except as a Tract distributor. 'Living movements,' he observes, 'do not come of committees, nor are great ideas worked out through the post, even though it had been the penny post.'¹

In a letter to Perceval, he says, 'If we altered to please every one, the effect would be spoiled. They were not intended as symbols *à cathedra*, but as the expression of individual minds; and individuals, feeling strongly, while on the one hand, they are incidentally faulty in mode or language, are still peculiarly effective. No great work was done by a system; whereas systems rise out of individual exertions. Luther was an individual. The very faults of an individual excite attention; he loses, but his cause (if good and he powerful-minded) gains. This is the way of things: we promote truth by a self-sacrifice.'²

At this moment Newman was sure that his cause was good, and he was conscious that he was 'powerful-minded'. He was thirty-two. In a man, thirty is the perfect age—I felt, he says, 'an exuberant and joyous energy . . . which I never had before or since.'³

¹ *Apologia*, p. 107.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 110-11.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

Of the ninety Tracts which appeared between 1833 and 1841 Newman wrote 28 or 29, viz., 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15,¹ 19, 20, 21, 31, 33, 34, 38,² 41,² 45, 47, 71,² 73, 74,³ 75, 79, 82,² 83, 85, 88, 90.²

The first is entitled, *Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission, Respectfully addressed to the Clergy*. It begins thus :—

‘ I am but one of yourselves,—a Presbyter ; and therefore I conceal my name, lest I should take too much on myself by speaking in my own person. Yet speak I must ; for the times are very evil, yet no one speaks against them.

‘ Is not this so ? Do not we “ look one upon another,” yet perform nothing ? Do we not all confess the peril into which the Church is come, yet sit still each in his own retirement, as if mountains and seas cut off brother from brother ? Therefore suffer me, while I try to draw you forth from those pleasant retreats, which it has been our blessedness hitherto to enjoy, to contemplate the condition and prospects of our Holy Mother in a practical way ; so that one and all may unlearn that idle habit, which has grown upon us, of owning the state of things to be bad, yet doing nothing to remedy it.

Consider a moment. Is it fair, is it dutiful, to suffer our Bishops to stand the brunt of the battle without doing our part to support them ? Upon them comes “ the care of all the Churches.” This cannot be helped ; indeed it is their glory. Not one of us would wish in the least to deprive them of the duties, the toils, the responsibilities of their high Office. And, black event

¹ No. 15, by William Palmer, was revised and completed by Newman.

² Republished in *Via Media*.

³ No. 74 is attributed by W. J. Copeland to B. Harrison.

as it would be for the country, yet (as far as they are concerned), we could not wish them a more blessed termination of their course, than the spoiling of their goods, and martyrdom.

‘To them then we willingly and affectionately relinquish their high privileges and honours; we encroach not upon the rights of the SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES; we touch not their sword and crosier. Yet surely we may be their shield-bearers in the battle without offence; and by our voice and deeds be to them what Luke and Timothy were to St. Paul.’

Newman was too much of an egoist to have a strong sense of humour; but he had a gift of ironical expression equal to that of Pascal; and we perceive him here displaying it, though at the same time the readers of this Tract were intended to take these words seriously. His real opinion of the bishops of his time is expressed in a letter to J. W. Bowden, written August 31, 1833,¹ just before the publication of this Tract:—‘As to the state of the Church, I suppose it was in a far worse condition in Arian times, except in the one point you mention—that there was the *possibility* of true-minded men becoming Bishops, which is now almost out of the question. If we had *one* Athanasius or Basil, we could bear with twenty Eusebius’s. . . . I wish the Archbishop [William Howley, 1766-1848] had somewhat of the boldness of the old Catholic prelates; no one can doubt he is a man of the highest principle, and would willingly die a martyr, but if he had but the little finger of Athanasius, he would do us all the good in the world.’

Many of the subsequent Tracts were *catenae* of passages from the old Anglican divines; and in 1835, when

¹ *Mozley*, i, 448.

Pusey joined the movement, the Tracts became, under his influence, solid works, sometimes of considerable length. Pusey's Tract, No. 67, *Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism* is a volume of 400 pages. In addition to the Tracts, there was included in the early volumes a series of *Records of the Church*, translations of short and telling extracts from the writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers.

It cannot be too often or too strongly emphasized that the object of Newman and his friends was purely and simply the defence of the Church of England, defence against Romanism as much as against Liberalism and Puritanism. Her best defence lay, they believed, in an intelligent comprehension by her sons and daughters of her essential nature as a living branch of the Catholic Church, and the realization of this belief in the daily lives of the people; so that Anglicanism would not deserve the reproach of being merely a religion on paper.

The effect of the Tracts throughout the country was supported by the influence of Newman's sermons at St. Mary's, spoken at four o'clock on Sunday afternoons, from 1828 to 1843. The virtue which went out from these discourses into the hearts of his young hearers and disciples was carried by them into the length and breadth of the land, wherever an Oxford man might settle.

Sermons, more than any other expression of the mind of man, are dependent for their kinetic power on time and place, on the preventing grace of God, directing not only the power and personality of the preacher, but also the temper, receptiveness and intelligence of the hearers. It is quite impossible for those who to-day read Newman's sermons to enter into the feelings of those who, eighty or ninety years ago, were in personal touch

with the man and hung on every word that he uttered. Dean Church says, 'While men were reading and talking about the Tracts, they were hearing the sermons; and in the sermons they heard the living meaning, and reason, and bearing of the Tracts, their ethical affinities, their moral standard. The sermons created a moral atmosphere, in which men judged the questions in debate.'¹

Many of his hearers have recorded their impressions of Newman's preaching. One of the most valuable, as coming from one quite outside the Tractarian party, is that of a Presbyterian, Dr. J. C. Shairp, late Principal of St. Andrew's University:—

'What there was of High Church teaching was implied rather than enforced. The local, the temporary, and the modern were ennobled by the presence of the catholic truth belonging to all ages that pervaded the whole. His power showed itself chiefly in the new and unlooked for way in which he touched into life old truths, moral or spiritual, which all Christians acknowledge, but most have ceased to feel—when he spoke of "Unreal Words," of "The Individuality of the Soul," of "The Invisible World," of a Particular "Providence;" or again, of "The Ventures of Faith," "Warfare the condition of Victory," "The Cross of Christ the Measure of the World," "The Church a Home for the Lonely." As he spoke, how the old truth became new! how it came home with a meaning never felt before! He laid his finger—how gently, yet how powerfully,—on some inner place in the hearer's heart, and told him things about himself he had never known till then. Subtle truths, which it would have taken philosophers pages of circumlocution and big

¹ *Oxford Movement*, p. 114.

words to state, were dropt out by the way in a sentence or two of the most transparent Saxon. What delicacy of style yet what strength! How simple yet how suggestive! How homely yet how refined! How penetrating yet how tender-hearted! . . . After hearing these sermons you might come away still not believing the tenets peculiar to the High Church system; but you would be harder than most men, if you did not feel more than ever ashamed of coarseness, selfishness, worldliness, if you did not feel the things of faith brought closer to the soul.' ¹

Another of Newman's hearers has recorded the following impressions:—'To those who are justly penetrated with the force and beauty of these printed sermons, we can only say with Aeschines, "What if you had heard himself pronounce it?" And yet nothing could at first sight be more opposite to the manner of the great Athenian orator. Action in the common sense of the word there was none. Through many of them the preacher never moved anything but his head. His hands were literally not seen from the beginning to the end. The sermon began in a calm musical voice, the key slightly rising as it went on; by-and-by the preacher warmed with his subject, it seemed as if his very soul and body glowed with suppressed emotion. There were times when, in the midst of the most thrilling passages, he would pause, without dropping his voice, for a moment which seemed long, before he uttered with gathered force and solemnity a few weighty words. The very tones of his voice seemed as if they were something more than his own.' ²

¹ *John Keble*, pp. 14-17, quoted by R. W. Church, *Oxford Movement*, p. 124f.

² Anon: quoted *Mozley*, ii, 219.

The Parochial Sermons, six volumes, were published 1834-1842 ; Vol. V of *Plain Sermons*, 1842 ; *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, 1843 ; and *Sermons Before the University of Oxford*, 1843.

The year 1833, which saw the beginning of the Tracts, saw also the publication of Newman's first book, *The Arians of the Fourth Century*. This work had been intended to form one of a series to be published by Rivington, and its original title was *First Volume of Councils*. But it was found unsuitable for the series, and was published separately. Newman took great pains with this book. The present value of *The Arians* does not lie so much in any fresh contribution that it made to our knowledge of historical facts, as in Newman's discussion of the points involved in the Arian controversy, and his presentation of the controversial methods of the Christian Fathers.

In particular, his treatment of what is called *The Economy* is very interesting and suggestive. The term *economy*, means properly *household management*. It is also spoken of as *dispensation*, which is the Latin equivalent for the Greek *economy*. *Stewardship* is another rendering in the New Testament. In the subject now before us, it has relation to the imparting of knowledge of religious truths. *Economy* of truth does not necessarily mean sparingness in the imparting of it, but rather a judicious discrimination, management. This tact in controversy, or tactics, was from one point of view called *The Economy* and from another point of view the *Disciplina Arcani*. 'If it is necessary to contrast the two with each other, the one may be considered as withholding the truth, and the other as setting it out to advantage. The economy is certainly sanctified by St. Paul in his own conduct. To the Jews he became as a

Jew, and as without the Law to the heathen. His behaviour at Athens is the most remarkable instance in his history of this method of acting. Instead of uttering any invective against their Polytheism, he began a discourse upon the Unity of the Divine Nature ; and then proceeded to claim the altar, consecrated in the neighbourhood to the unknown God, as the property of Him whom he preached to them, and to enforce his doctrine of the Divine Immateriality, not by miracles, but by argument, and that founded on the words of a heathen poet ¹. . . . Economics are representations conveying substantial truth in the form in which we are best able to receive it.' ² 'The economical method, that is, of accommodation to the feelings and prejudices of the hearer, in leading him to the reception of a novel or unacceptable doctrine. . . . Those who are strangers to the tone of thought and principles of the speaker, cannot at once be initiated into his system, and . . . they must begin with imperfect views ; and therefore, if he is to teach them at all, he must put before them large propositions, which he has afterwards to modify, or make assertions which are but parallel or analogous to the truth, rather than coincident with it. And it cannot be denied that those who attempt to speak at all times the naked truth, or rather the commonly-received expression of it, are certain, more than other men, to convey wrong impressions of their meaning to those who happen to be below them, or to differ widely from them, in intelligence and cast of mind. On the other hand, the abuse of the Economy in the hands of unscrupulous reasoners is obvious. . . . Here the obvious rule to guide our practice is, to be careful ever to maintain substantial truth in our use of the economical method.'

¹ p. 65.

² p. 77.

CHAPTER V

VIA MEDIA, I

WHEN Newman started the Tracts, his mind was set on 'a second Reformation' of the Church of England; 'a better reformation, for it would be a return not to the sixteenth century, but to the seventeenth.'¹

Let us here take note of the fundamental mistake underlying this purpose. To idealise the past, or any one age in it, is, if it be attempted to materialize the ideals, suicidal in the long run. The Body of Christ, the Church, is indwelt by the life of Christ; and life means growth and progress in some form. There may be some practical advantage in agreeing to pretend that it is five o'clock when it is in reality half-past three; but only disaster can follow the pretence that it is half-past three when it is really five.

There are three propositions about which, at this time, Newman was confident:—

1. 'The principle of dogma; my battle was with liberalism; by liberalism I meant the anti-dogmatic principle and its developments.'

2. 'I was confident . . . that there was a visible Church, with Sacraments and rites which are the channels of invisible grace.' In particular, he upheld the Episcopal system, as inculcated in the Epistles of St. Ignatius.

3. 'The Church of Rome was bound up with the cause of Anti-Christ by the Council of Trent.'²

¹ *Apologia*, p. 113.

² *Ibid.*, p. 119-f.

These positions were consolidated in Newman's mind by an effort of study and composition which received a stimulus from the appointment, in 1836, of Dr. Hampden as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

Renn Dickson Hampden (1793-1868) had been a Fellow of Oriel, Bampton Lecturer, and Principal of St. Mary Hall. When Lord Melbourne offered him the Regius Professorship, there was violent opposition raised to the appointment on the ground that Hampden's views were unorthodox. The work of his to which exception was chiefly taken was his Bampton Lectures of 1832 on the 'Scholastic Philosophy considered in its Relation to Christian Theology.' In these lectures, he maintained, amongst other things, that the authority of the Scriptures was of greater weight than the authority of the Church. Newman wrote *Elucidations of Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements* as his contribution to the literature of the controversy. Hampden's opponents did not succeed in preventing his appointment to the professorship; but they did manage to inflict on him an academical snub by procuring his exclusion from the board which nominates Select Preachers to the University. A still more serious storm was raised in 1847, when Hampden was offered the bishopric of Hereford. Thirteen bishops presented an address of remonstrance to the Premier; but, on the other hand, fifteen of the Heads of Houses at Oxford publicly testified to their belief in his orthodoxy and integrity.

While the Tractarian party was being stimulated into polemical activity on one side by a Broad Church victory—Dr. Hampden's appointment to the Regius Professorship—there was at the same time 'a certain liveliness' on the other battle front, the age-long and chronic antagonism with Rome.

Newman noted later that 'March 1836 is a cardinal point of time.' Of the events which that date 'gathers about it' the following are perhaps the most significant of 'a new scene gradually opened':—'Froude's death. My knowing and using the Breviary. Start of the Library of the Fathers. My writing against the Church of Rome.'¹

An aggressive movement of Roman propaganda was begun in 1835 by Monsignor Wiseman, Rector of the English College in Rome, who was then acting as Chaplain to the Sardinian Embassy in London. When Newman was in Rome in 1833, he and Froude had had a friendly conversation with Wiseman, in the course of which Newman said, 'I am sure God has some work for me to do in England.'² But now Wiseman was in Newman's eyes a formidable champion of a Church 'bound up with the cause of Antichrist.' Wiseman's *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church* were published in 1836.

Newman's counter-offensive took various forms. He engaged in a controversial correspondence with a French priest, the Abbé Jager, which with a series of lectures delivered in Adam de Brome's Chapel in St. Mary's, Oxford, was subsequently worked up into a book, *The Prophetical Office of the Church*. Some other of his larger works were similarly sketched out in courses of parochial lectures, delivered at Advent and Easter. In this way were composed the Lectures on Justification, and those on Antichrist (Tract No. 83), and those on the *Scriptural Proofs of the Doctrines of the Church* (Tract No. 85), all published in 1838.

Although Newman in his *Chronological Notes*, dated his writing against the Church of Rome as about March

¹ Mozley, ii, 177.

² *Ibid.*, i, 428.

1836, he had published on January 1 in that year, as Tract No. 71, a pamphlet *On the Controversy with the Romanists*, or, as more adequately described, when republished in 1877, *On the Mode of Conducting the Controversy with Rome*. This is written in 'a sobriety of mind' natural to one who is keenly alive to the imperfections and deficiencies of his own communion. The writer begins by insisting that there is no need for an offensive against Rome; our business is simply to act on the defensive. But to satisfy those who demand a more active policy he adduces and discusses 'specimens of those practical grievances' to which Christians are subjected in the Roman Communion: The denial of the Cup to the laity; the necessity of the Priest's Intention to the validity of the Sacraments; the necessity of Confession; the unwarranted Anathemas of the Roman Church; Purgatory; the Invocation of Saints; the Worship of Images. Newman dwells at length and with minuteness on the 'blasphemies' of Mariolatry, and the inconsistency of Roman authorities on the subject.

The full title of the book which resulted on this occasion was *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church, viewed in relation to Romanism and Popular Protestantism*. It was published in 1837. A second edition, slightly enlarged, appeared in 1838; and it was republished with notes in 1877, as vol. i of a collection called *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*.

By 'the prophetical office of the Church' is meant its office of 'teaching, as contrasted with its sacerdotal office, which has to do with the Sacred Ministry.' The expression does not occur in the lectures themselves; and it was probably suggested by a subsequently conceived design of writing a companion work on the

sacerdotal office of the Church, which, however, came to nothing.

The title which first suggested itself to Newman was *Lectures on the Middle Way between Romanism and Popular Protestantism*.¹ He had already (in 1834) written two Tracts (Nos. 38 and 41) on the *Via Media*. In the former of these, Clericus, the Anglo-Catholic disputant, declares that 'the glory of the English Church is, that it has taken the VIA MEDIA, as it has been called. It lies *between* the (so-called) Reformers and the Romanists.' It is significant that in the *Prophetical Office*² Newman describes this *Via Media* as 'a road over mountains and rivers, which has never been cut.' This book was intended as an attempt to cut it. Nothing less was proposed than 'to offer helps towards the formation of a recognized Anglican theology in one of its departments. . . . We have a vast inheritance, but no inventory of its treasures.'³ At a later date, when the vision seemed but an idle dream, the *Via Media* is spoken of as 'a possible road, lying between a mountain and a morass, to be driven through formidable obstacles, if it is to exist, by the boldness and skill of the engineers.'⁴

In 1836 the engineer had no misgivings as to the feasibility of his design. The anxiety he expresses (Letter of January 7, 1837) is about the book as a means to an end, not about the end itself. It indicated even a greater aversion from the morass than dread of the mountain. This is what he says in the letter referred to⁵ :—'I cannot conceal from myself that it is neither more nor less than hitting Protestantism a hard blow in

¹ Letter of January 7, 1837, *Mozley*, ii, 221.

² p. 17.

³ p. 24 ⁴ Preface to Third Ed., p. xxii. ⁵ *Mozley*, ii, 221.

the face. . . . Pusey has seen one lecture, and he said, without my speaking, that it would put people out of breath, so that they would not be able to retort ; and that before they recover their wind, we must fetch them a second blow.' And yet when the book appeared it was usually called *Lectures on Romanism* ; and Newman himself so refers to it. While the Church of Rome comes in for most of the direct hits, the basal assumptions are anti-Protestant ; it is a case of

Euphelia serves to grace my measure,
But Chloe is my real flame.

Popular Protestantism is a vague, elusive, amorphous thing, with which it is not easy to come to grips. In the Advertisement to these lectures it is defined as ' that generalized idea of religion now in repute, which merges all differences of faith and principle between Protestants as minor matters, as if the larger denominations among us agreed with us in essentials, and differed only in the accidents of form, ritual, government, or usage.' At the present day this ' generalized idea ' is called Undenominationalism.

When Popular Protestantism makes positive affirmations, Newman would call it Puritanism. In an article written about two years after this,¹ Puritanism is compared to the English language in respect of the variety of sources to which it is indebted :—' This religious creed is made up of the fragments of religion which the course of events has brought together and has imbedded in it, something of Lutheranism, and something of Calvinism, something of Erastianism, and something of Zuinglianism, a little Judaism, and a little

¹ *British Critic* for April, 1839.

dogmatism, and not a little secularity, as if by hazard. It has no straightforward view on any one point on which it professes to teach; and to hide its poverty it has dressed itself out in a maze of words which all enquirers feel and are perplexed with, yet few are able to penetrate.'

Then, speaking of the 'many societies and institutions' of Puritanism, he continues: 'Imposing and flourishing as they are in appearance, they have as little power to stop the march of opinion as a man in a boat to act directly on its motion; they are the mere material or corporeal part of the system, the instrument, not the living principle of the soul. Thus the matter stands as regards the far-spread religious confederacy of our days. We have no dread of it at all; we only fear what it may lead to.'¹

The department of theology with which these lectures were primarily concerned is the article in the Creed, 'the Holy Catholic Church.' It cannot be denied that the tenets of the great Anglican divines in respect of this article have not caught the imagination of the average English Churchman. When he repeats the Creed, the average worshipper, if he thinks at all of the meaning of what he is saying, assumes that 'the Holy Catholic Church' is something which is emphatically not in the same order of being as 'the Roman Catholic Church;' something mystical, undefined, which has no necessary connexion with anything visible on earth.

The object of the *Prophetical Office* was to prove that it is possible to believe in the existence on earth, here and now, of the Holy Catholic Church, without becoming a Roman Catholic; it was 'to prevent such persons as

¹ *British Critic*, April, 1839, pp. 418, 419.

have right but vague ideas concerning it, from deviating into Romanism because no other system of doctrine is provided for them.'¹

To attain this object it was necessary directly to attack Romanism, not merely for the purpose of showing that Anglo-Catholicism is not Popery, but because Romanism 'has pre-occupied the ground, and we cannot erect our own structure without partly breaking down, partly using what we find upon it.'²

Much as Newman revolted from Popular Protestantism, there was nothing half-hearted in his attack on Romanism. He put his whole strength into it; and the measure of his own estimate of the force of the attack is revealed in the great pains he was at in later years to refute his own arguments. He republished the book, indeed; but its identity is obscured by its inclusion as an item in a collection entitled *Via Media*; and, in this third edition special protection is provided for Romanist readers in the shape of notes and an elaborate preface of eighty pages.

To the Anglican reader, Newman's presentation in this preface, of Roman assumptions as to the nature of the Church is in itself a satisfactory reason for rejecting them. Starting³ with the familiar conception of the office of the Christ as threefold, Prophet, Priest, and King, he assumes that Holy Church, as the continuation of the Incarnation, the present representative on earth of Christ, has likewise a triple function of teaching sacrificing and rule. It began as 'a religious rite,' having its 'special centre of action' in 'pastor and flock'; next it added the function of 'a philosophy,' with its seat in 'the schools'; 'lastly it seated itself,

¹ p. 5.

² p. 6.

³ p. xl.

as an ecclesiastical polity, among princes; and chose Rome for its centre'; 'The Papacy and its Curia' constitute the seat of the Church as 'a political power.'

This admission of the late date at which the Regal office of the Church manifested itself is startling. But what follows proves how completely the healthy moral sense, to which Newman paid sincere homage in his Anglican days, had been warped by the materialistic pretensions of Rome.

'Truth,' he says¹ 'is the guiding principle of theology and theological inquiries; devotion and edification of worship; and of government, expedience.' . . . 'Arduous as are the duties involved in these three offices, to discharge one by one, much more arduous are they to administer, when taken in combination. . . . Each has to find room for the claims of the other two; and each will find its own line of action influenced and modified by the others, nay, sometimes in a particular case the necessity of the others converted into a rule of duty for itself.'

He thus seems to hold that the discharge by the Church of its Regal office implies that expedience pure and simple must always be one of the guiding principles of the Church's action; and in many cases, the sole principle of action. When to this consideration we add that when God gave the gift of Infallibility to the Church, He unfortunately forgot to accompany it by the gift of Impeccability, we have an explanation of 'the differences between the formal teaching of the Church, and its popular and political manifestation;' an explanation, but hardly a justification. The Romanist assumes, in fact, that the moral Governor of the world is more

¹ p. xli.

concerned that men should form accurate intellectual judgements than that they should set before themselves ideals that are 'true, honourable, just, pure, lovely and of good report.' It must be observed, moreover, that in a world governed on moral principles 'a right judgement in all things' cannot be reached on intellectual grounds alone.

In Tract No. 41, Newman speaks of 'the unbelief of restlessness and fear' as contrasted with 'the unbelief of profaneness'—diseases respectively of Romanism and Protestantism. He was himself beginning to be infected with 'the unbelief of restlessness and fear,' an insidious malady of which the victim is unaware; the unbelief that cannot be patient with God's slowness, but is satisfied with an apparent victory, no matter how obtained.

Of the fourteen lectures contained in the *Prophetical Office* Newman the Roman Catholic repudiated wholly Nos. 3 and 4, which deal with the Doctrine of Infallibility morally and politically considered, and the second part of No. 7, which is the last of three on the Use and Abuse of Private Judgement. He rejected in part No. 8, on the Indefectibility of the Church Catholic, and Nos. 9 and 10, on the Essentials of the Gospel. But with the rest, which represents the anti-Protestant element common to Romanism and Anglicanism, he naturally had no fault to find.

CHAPTER VI

VIA MEDIA, II

NEWMAN'S object in writing *The Prophetical Office* was not altogether *pro bono publico* ; he did not merely wish to make it easier for others to believe in the *Via Media* ; he wanted to find a basis in reason for his own beliefs. It was an endeavour to show that the *Via Media* was as a system intelligible and consistent. 'The proof of reality in a doctrine is its holding together when actually attempted.'¹ It must be proved to be a real thing ; for 'when men think they may create what they are to worship, their devotion cannot possess any high degree of reverence and godly fear.'²

Newman was satisfied that the *Via Media* was not a creature of the imagination ; but he was also aware of the grounds for affirming that it had no objective existence. He gave emphatic expression to this allegation in the Introduction :—'Protestantism and Popery are real religions . . . but the *Via Media*, viewed as an integral system, has never had existence except on paper. . . . It still remains to be tried whether what is called Anglo-Catholicism . . . is capable of being professed, acted on, and maintained on a large sphere of action and through a sufficient period, or whether it be a mere modification or transition-state either of Romanism or of popular Protestantism.'³ Again, 'Erroneous or not, a view it [i.e. Romanism] certainly does present ; and that religion which attempts a view, though imperfect or extreme, does more than those forms of religion

¹ p. 16.

² p. 22.

³ pp. 16, 17.

which do not attempt it at all.'¹ Newman's earnest desire was 'to bring out in a substantive form a living Church of England.'

Let us here briefly examine the reasonableness of Newman's charge against the Anglicanism of the seventeenth century divines, that it was, after all, a religion that existed only on paper.

The notions and ideas that exist in the mind of a man must needs be recorded on paper (or some other writing material) for their preservation, until they shall have been realized in human society. A system on paper, then, has precisely the same value, in itself, as the ideal which is living and active in the mind of any particular man. As long as it is on paper it is, at the least, available for use ; it does not perish with the hand that wrote it.

Every *ism*, in the ideal of it, exists only on paper ; there is always a divergence between a man's theory and his practice. For the most part, his practice is less perfect than his theory ; yet although, strictly speaking, his theory exists only on paper, its existence is not an unreality.

This charge of paper existence is one to which Romanism is just as liable as is any other *ism*. Those of us who have come into actual touch with Romanism as practised know well enough that the account of it in the following extract is not true to facts ; it is the Romanism that exists only on paper.

Speaking of St. Alfonso da Liguori's Mariolatry, Newman says :—' Such devotional manifestations in honour of our Lady . . . are suitable for Italy, but they are not suitable for England. . . . Only this I know full

¹ p. 6.

well . . . that the Catholic Church allows no image of any sort, material or immaterial, no dogmatic symbol, no rite, no sacrament, no saint, not even the Blessed Virgin herself, to come between the soul and its Creator. It is face to face, "solus cum solo" in all matters between man and his God. He alone creates; He alone has redeemed; before His awful eyes we go in death; in the vision of Him is our eternal beatitude.'¹

But the truth is that—though it may seem a bold thing to say—Newman, even in his Anglican days, altogether misconceived the nature of Anglicanism. Thus, in *Home Thoughts Abroad*, written in the spring of 1836, he makes the Anglican disputant, in a dialogue, say, 'The Church is founded on a *doctrine*—on the Gospel of truth.' We repudiate this statement; we affirm that the Church is founded on a *Person*. This Person is revealed to us, as to His character and nature, in the New Testament, the meaning of which is gradually unfolded through the actual experience of the Church, in which experience the power of the Personality of the Incarnate Son is realized as a life-giving Spirit. We start with 'the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ;' and the development of doctrine which we acknowledge as legitimate and genuine is based on a 'growth in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'

We have been dealing with the year 1837. In the *Apologia* Newman states that his confidence in the Church of England remained unimpaired till 1839, when it received its first blow. The blow, however, fell on a somewhat weakened combatant. He notes elsewhere

¹ *Apologia*, p. 318.

that a letter to Bowden of August 17, 1838¹ 'marked the date of a change of fortune' and that a letter to Keble of November 21, in the same year² 'was the last occasion on which he could prefer a claim for *confidence*' on the part of his fellow-workers in the cause.

There were signs of a split in the party. Thomas Keble and others, who claimed to speak for the country clergy, thought he was going too fast; and their uneasiness was authorized, so to speak, by the somewhat unfavourable notice taken of the Tracts in the Bishop of Oxford's charge. The Bishop said 'that there were some expressions in them which might be injurious to particular minds, and he conjured us not to go too far, etc.'³

At this time the object of Newman's mental activities seems to have undergone a change. He was not so much engaged in propagating a definite Anglo-Catholicism, as feeling his way half unconsciously towards something beyond it. 'My constant feeling,' he says, 'when I write is that I do not realize things, but am merely drawing out intellectual conclusions, which I need not say is very uncomfortable.'⁴ Again, 'What is to be our length of tether I know not--no one can know. It is a fearful and interesting thought, but at present it is lengthening out.'⁵

An article in the *British Critic* of April, 1839, the greater part of which was Newman's, 'contains', he said many years later, 'the last words which I ever spoke as an Anglican to Anglicans.'⁶ It repays careful perusal, not only from its significance in the history of the

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 259.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 269.

³ *Ibid.*, ii, 259 f.

⁴ Letter to Keble, December 5, 1838. *Mozley*, ii, 274.

⁵ Letter to Mrs. J. Mozley, January 9, 1839. *Mozley*, ii, 277.

⁶ *Apologia*, p. 182.

writer's development, but because of its intrinsic merits. The article is nominally a review of a number of theological books and pamphlets; but these are scarcely mentioned; the page heading is 'State of Religious Parties.' The article is inspired from beginning to end with buoyant exaltation. It begins with an account of the originating causes of the Tractarian Movement. It is interesting—as exemplifying the relativity of time—that the publication of the Tracts, which had commenced a little more than five years previously, is dated 'several years since.' We need not now deal with this very important contribution to Church history beyond saying that it is indispensable to the student of the Oxford Movement, and has in fact been largely drawn on by writers on that subject. It is, however, pertinent to our purpose to quote the following passage as an expression of Newman's feeling that he and his friends were but the agents of a power outside themselves:—

'Of course every event in human affairs has a beginning; and a beginning implies a when, and a where, and a by whom, and how. But except in these necessary circumstances, the phenomenon in question is quite independent of things visible and historical. It is not here or there; it has no progress, no causes, no fortunes; it is not a movement, it is a spirit, it is a spirit afloat, neither in the secret chambers nor in the desert but everywhere. It is within us, rising up in the heart where it is least expected, and working its way, though not in secret, yet so subtly and impalpably, as hardly to admit of precaution or encounter on any ordinary human rules of opposition. It is an adversary in the air, a something one and entire, a whole wherever it is, unapproachable and incapable of being grasped, as being the result of causes far deeper than political or

other visible agencies, the spiritual awakening of spiritual wants.'¹

Some pages further on, the writer ventures on a confident anticipation :—' In spite of the dread of antiquity, the calumny of Popery, the hatred of austerity, the reluctance to inquire, and the vast hubbub which is thereby caused on all sides of us—we have good hope meanwhile that a system will be rising up superior to the age, yet harmonizing with and carrying out its higher points, which will attract to itself those who are willing to make a venture and face difficulties, for the sake of something higher in prospect.'²

Then there follows a prediction :—' Whether the English Church can keep a firm grasp of Laud's divinity or not, it is very certain that neither Puritanism or Liberalism has any permanent inheritance with her.'³

The following passages are of considerable interest as the impressions of an acute and far-seeing observer :—

' The phenomenon, which has long been preparing in this country, is a European movement. . . . To what does the current of opinion point ? It points everywhere to dogmatism, to mysticism, or to asceticism ; it points on one side to popery, on another to pantheism ; on another to democracy ; it does *not* point to the schools of the Reformation. . . . Surely then our true wisdom now is to look for some *Via Media*, which will preserve us from what threatens, though it cannot restore the dead.'⁴

' Surely it will be better for you, Ultra-Protestant as you are, instead of reproaching them [the Tractarians] with a storm, which is none of their raising, to thank them for making the best of a bad matter, and to use

¹ p. 402.

³ p. 417.

² p. 416.

⁴ p. 425.

them as pilots to guide them through it. Though the current of the age cannot be stopped, it may be directed ; and it is better that it should find its way into the Anglican port, than that it should be propelled into Popery, or drifted upon unbelief. ' ¹

Such is the conclusion of this remarkable article, which he afterwards saw to be the last confident expression of his Anglo-Catholicism.

In view of the fact that Newman did not resign his living till September 1843, it may naturally be asked, in what capacity did he speak and write during the intervening four and a half years ?

The answer is that his reason had become literally *distracted* ; drawn one way by a true *ideal*, not yet realized—the realization of which his bodily eye could never see—drawn another way by the impressive *fact* of Rome, a fact of the time now present. ' The unbelief of restlessness and fear ' won in this case ; ' He gave them their desire, and sent leanness withal into their soul.'

What, then, was the blow which staggered him ? It was in the summer of 1839 that the abnormal development in Newman of the ' Institutional ' bias became positively diseased. ' About the middle of June,' he says, ' I began to study and master the history of the Monophysites. I was absorbed in the doctrinal question. . . . My [Anglican] stronghold was Antiquity ; now here, in the middle of the fifth century, I found, as it seemed to me, Christendom of the sixteenth and the mineteenth centuries reflected. I saw my face in that mirror, and I was a Monophysite. The Church of the *Via Media* was in the position of the Oriental communion,

Rome was, where she now is ; and the Protestants were the Eutychians.' ¹

This quotation demands some notes and comments. Although Newman may have been 'absorbed in the doctrinal question,' it was what history revealed as to the state of the Church's constitution in the fifth century that disturbed his mind. This comes out in a letter of July 12, 1839, to F. Rogers:—'Two things are very remarkable at Chalcedon—the great power of the Pope (as great as he claims now almost), and the marvellous interference of the civil power, as great almost as in our kings.' ² Now, Erastianism was for Newman an impossible alternative to Romanism.

The conception of the idea of this historical parallel came as a shock to Newman's insecurely based Anglicanism. It was succeeded by another blow in September, when Wiseman's article on Anglican claims, in the August number of the *Dublin Review*, was put into his hands.

Let us hear what he said himself, at the time, in a letter to F. Rogers, of September 22:—'Since I wrote to you, I have had the first real hit from Romanism which has happened to me. R. W. [Robert Williams], who has been passing through, directed my attention to Dr. Wiseman's article in the new "Dublin". I must confess it has given me a stomach-ache. You see the whole history of the Monophysites has been a sort of alternative. And now comes this dose at the end of it. It does certainly come upon one that we are not at the bottom of things. At this moment we have sprung a leak ; and the worst of it is that those sharp fellows, Ward, Stanley and Co. will not let one go to sleep upon it. . . . I seriously think this a most uncomfortable article on

¹ *Apologia*, pp. 208, 209.

² *Mozley*, ii, 284.

every account, though of course it is *ex parte*. . . . I think I shall get Keble to answer it. As to Pusey, I am curious to see how it works with him. . . . There is an uncomfortable vista opened which was closed before. '¹

There is a passage in a letter written a few days earlier (September 15) which may be a playful allusion to some topic now unknown, but which may, on the contrary, be a symptom of real mental disturbance: 'You see, if things were to come to the worst, I should turn Brother of Charity in London—an object which, *quite* independently of any such perplexities, is growing on me, and, peradventure, will some day be accomplished, if other things do not impede me.' '²

According to an article by H. W. Wilberforce³ Newman, in the beginning of October, 1839, while walking in the New Forest with a friend, 'made the astounding confidence' that 'a vista has been opened before me, to the end of which I do not see.' He added 'that he had thought, if ever the time should come when he was in serious danger, of asking his friends to pray that, if it was not indeed the will of God, he might be taken away before he did it.'

Wilberforce thought that the image of the vista was suggested to Newman by the forest scenery around him at the time; but it occurs in the letter of September 22 quoted above.

Wiseman's article was 'on the Donatists, with an application to Anglicanism.' It would seem that the force of its impact on Newman's imagination was not due to the cogency of its doctrinal arguments, but in its reinforcement of the effect already produced on his mind by the

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 286.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 285.

³ Quoted, *Mozley*, ii, 287.

history of the fifth century: 'My friend . . . pointed out the palmary words of St. Augustine,' quoted in the article, '*Securus judicat orbis terrarum* [There is no appeal against the decision of the whole world]. He repeated these words again and again, and, when he was gone, they kept ringing in my ears. . . . They decided ecclesiastical questions on a simpler rule than that of Antiquity. . . . By those great words of the ancient Father, the theory of the *Via Media* was absolutely pulverised.' ¹

This, of course, relates to the effect of the words on Newman's imagination, not on his reason. His unconscious bias in favour of the papistical conception of the Church was not, strictly speaking, reasonable; it was 'an hypothesis' (to use his own expression) which was mastering him.

To resume Newman's subsequent reflections in the *Apologia*:—'After a while, I got calm, and at length the vivid impression upon my imagination faded away. . . . Meanwhile, so far as this was certain, I had seen the shadow of a hand upon the wall. . . . He who has seen a ghost, cannot be as if he had never seen it. The heavens had opened and closed again. The thought for the moment had been, "The Church of Rome will be found right after all;" and then it had vanished. My old convictions remained as before.' ²

Newman's old convictions were now forced back on a line of defence and attack which is very strong indeed, considerations based on the Note of the Church, which is second in order, that of Sanctity. He says, with that admirable candour which always made his Roman friends uneasy, 'The ground which I felt good against her

¹ *Apologia*, p. 211f.

² p. 213.

[Rome] was the moral ground; I felt I could not be wrong in striking at her political and social line of action. . . . I had an unspeakable aversion to the policy and acts of Mr. O'Connell, because, as I thought, he associated himself with men of all religions and no religion against the Anglican Church, and advanced Catholicism by violence and intrigue. When then I found him taken up by the English Catholics, and, as I supposed, at Rome, I considered I had a fulfilment before my eyes how the Court of Rome played fast and loose, and fulfilled the bad points which I had seen put down in books against it. Here we saw what Rome was in action, whatever she might be when quiescent. Her conduct was simply secular and political.' ¹

Again, 'What is a higher guide for us in speculation and in practice, than that conscience of right and wrong, of truth and falsehood, those sentiments of what is decorous, consistent, and noble, which our Creator has made a part of our original nature? Therefore I felt I could not be wrong in attacking what I fancied was a fact—the unscrupulousness, the deceit, and the intriguing spirit of the agents and representatives of Rome.' ²

Meanwhile, the force of the Roman 'push' of the summer of 1839 is shown by the theological expedients and analogies by which Newman endeavoured to make his position outside the Church of Rome comfortable or even tolerable. This is at least reflected in his correspondence:—'I can't help thinking I shall find St. Austin agreeing that, under circumstances, grace is given in a schismatical Church, and that in the very controversy with the Donatists which is Dr. W.'s strong ground.' . . . 'Again, the Romanists grant that those who in time of

¹ *Apologia*, p. 222f

² *Ibid.*, p. 262.

schism *bona fide* adhere to an anti-Pope, yet are virtually in communion with the centre of unity. . . . If so, as ignorance may be one legitimate excuse, there may be others also. As the Archbishop of C. is *Pope* to those who are not better informed, so he may be to those who, born and ordained in the English Church, afterwards *are* otherwise informed.'

'Once more; as those who sin after baptism cannot at once return to their full privileges, yet are not without hope, so a Church which has broken away from the centre of unity is not at liberty at once to return, yet is not nothing. May she not put herself into a state of penance? Are not her children best fulfilling their duty to her—not by leaving her, but by promoting her return, and not thinking they have a *right* to rush into such higher state as communion with the centre of unity might give them? If the Church Catholic, indeed, has actually commanded their return to her at once, that is another matter; but this she cannot have done without pronouncing their present Church good-for-nothing, which I do not suppose Rome has done of us.'¹

In a letter of November 17 to his sister, Mrs. J. Mozley, he speaks of the possibility of resigning both his living and his Fellowship.² He does not speak of personal difficulties, but of the growing opposition to the Movement.

But however Newman might betray his secret uneasiness to his intimates, in public he opposed Romanism as confidently as ever, and on the moral ground mentioned above. We have seen to what a degree the necessity of 'communion with the centre of unity' obsessed him; yet when in January 1840 a Roman

¹ Letter to F. Rogers, October 3, 1839, *Mozley*, ii, 288.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 292, 293.

Catholic priest, the Rev. the Hon'ble George Spencer, formerly an Anglican clergyman, came to Oxford 'to get Anglicans to set about praying for Unity,' Newman wrote to him in the following strain :—' This is what especially distresses us ; this is what we cannot understand ; how Christians like yourselves, with the clear view you have that a warfare is ever waging in the world between good and evil, should, in the present state of England, ally yourselves with the side of evil against the side of good.' ¹

Unfortunately, Newman did not maintain his position, as he might have done, on this unassailable high ground.

His formal reply to Dr. Wiseman was an article on the Catholicity of the English Church, published in the *British Critic*, January 1840.² Yet on February 25, in a letter to his sister, after a pessimistic summing up of all the more or less anti-Christian forces in society, he says, ' I begin to have serious apprehensions lest any religious body is strong enough to withstand the league of evil but the Roman Church.' ³

The tone and temper of Newman's reply to Wiseman's attack betray his growing sense of the weakness of his own position. It is a long document, displaying much learning and acuteness, but vitiated throughout by the adoption of his adversary's assumptions. Now and then the Anglican in him hits out with vigour, as we shall see ; but for the most part he cries for mercy, and whines under a galling sense of essential inferiority.

He begins with a dialogue between an Anglo-Catholic

¹ *Apologia*, p. 225.

² This was nominally a review on a book by the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, entitled *An Apology for the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession* ; and it does, in fact, at its beginning, do justice to some features of that useful and remarkable little book.

³ *Mozley*, ii, 300.

and a Romanist, the declared intention of which is to show the strength of the Romanist position. We are reminded of the principle on which Dr. Johnson presented the debates in Parliament to the readers of the *Gentleman's Magazine*: 'I saved appearances tolerably well; but I took care that the Whig dogs should not have the best of it.' All through one feels that those terrible words (as he thought them) of St. Augustine, *securus judicat orbis terrarum*, are haunting the writer's consciousness. The insularity of the English Church, its confessed lack of the note of inter-communion, is acknowledged as a damning blot, for which excuses and palliations may be made, but which cannot be effaced. St. Cyprian's view of the episcopate in relation to the whole Church is adopted.¹ 'The Anglican view then, of the Church has ever been this, that its portions need not otherwise have been united together for their essential completeness than as being descended from one original. They are like a number of colonies sent out from a mother country.'² The alleged consequence of this position is that the Church in each country must accommodate itself to the requirements of the local civil government; and Newman sets out in great detail everything that is most offensive to a Churchman's feelings in the legal relations of Church and State in England, as being natural and consistent with what he calls the Anglican view of the Catholic Church. This part of the article makes one exclaim with Falstaff, 'Call you this backing of your friends? A plague upon such backing! Give me them that will face me.'

¹ 'Each bishop a complete channel of grace, and ultimate centre of unity' (p. 62).

² p. 54.

‘The unbelief of restlessness and fear’ which Newman had, at an earlier date, noted as characteristic of Romanism, was now suggesting the awful thought that he could not be saved in the English Church. The whole article shows the writer seeking excuses for remaining out of communion with Rome. Thus, ‘The Bishop of Rome, the head of the Catholic world, is not the centre of unity, except as having a primacy of order. Accordingly, even granting for argument’s sake that the English Church violated a duty in the sixteenth century, in releasing itself from the Roman supremacy, still it did not thereby commit that special sin which cuts off from it the fountains of grace, and is called schism. . . . And as it did not enter into the Church invisible by joining Rome, so it was not cast out of it by breaking from Rome.’¹ . . . ‘*Catholicity*, and not the *Pope*, is the essence of the Church.’² This is the Gallican view; and Newman claims³ that Article XIX takes this (Gallican) view of Unity.

Again, he pleads⁴ ‘There are various notes of truths of various cogency; the only question is, what is the *essential* note; because intercommunion is an important one, it does not follow that the essence of the Church does not lie in the possession of Apostolical succession.’

Then Newman⁵ begins his offensive against Rome by charging her with the abandonment of Antiquity, as regards (1) Giving communion to infants, (2) The denial of the Cup to the laity, (3) The enforcement of clerical celibacy, and (4) Approbation of Aristotelian logic, which was condemned by many of the Fathers. A very interesting passage follows in which a line of thought is

¹ p. 58.⁴ p. 67.² p. 65.³ p. 66.⁵ p. 68.

indicated which he subsequently followed up in one of his most famous books, the *Essay on Development of Christian Doctrine*. 'When,' he says¹ 'we object to the Romanists that their Church has changed in the course of years, they not unfrequently acknowledge it, and are philosophical on the subject. They say that all systems have their development; that nothing begins as it ends; that nothing can come into the world *totis numeris*, that the seed becomes a tree, and the child a man.'

At this time Newman was ready to adopt Salmon's retort 'Was it only in Rome that Christianity was to develop itself? Was it not also to do so in Germany and England? . . . The doctrine of development is a many-edged weapon. There are Eastern developments and Western ones, Protestant and Romish, even infidel developments; which is the right one?'² In a similar spirit, Newman 'proposes to carry this principle a little further. . . . It is surely unfair to carry on the development of the Church only just to the point which serves our purpose, and to be indulgent towards tyranny within it, while we make no allowance for insubordination.'

And he points out that *securus judicat, etc.*, has an edge for Romanism as well as for Anglicanism:—'Just as Augustine says the Church's judgement is above its branches, so does he elsewhere insist on its being above the decision of the Pope.'

Then follow some positive arguments³:—'Directly it is granted that active intercourse is not *absolutely necessary* as a note of the Church, leave is given for adducing *other* circumstances which may serve to evidence what intercourse would evidence, if it existed.' These notes are summed up thus⁴:—'As for the English Church,

¹ p. 69.

² *Infallibility*, pp. 39, 41.

³ p. 72.

⁴ p. 79.

surely she has notes enough,' 'the signs of an Apostle in all patience, and signs and wonders and mighty deeds.' She has the note of possession, the note of freedom from party titles; the note of life, a tough life and a vigorous; she has ancient descent, unbroken continuance, agreement in doctrine with the ancient Church. Those of Bellarmine's notes, which she certainly has not, are inter-communion with Christendom, the glory of miracles, and the prophetic light; but the question is, 'whether she has not enough of divinity about her to satisfy her sister Churches on their own principles, that she is one with them.'

'The note of possession' means that the Church of England holds the ancient sees without rival. At this date, Roman bishops in England had no English territorial titles; and when, in 1850, they began to name their districts after English towns, they were not permitted to use for this purpose the existing ancient English sees. Hence Newman says,¹ 'Either *we* are the Catholic Church in England, or there is *no* Catholic Church here.'

'The note of freedom from party titles' is explained on p. 74, where Newman in dealing with the Roman taunt that Anglicans have practically given up calling themselves Catholics, he replies, 'At least we have never borne the name of mortal man,' as all heretics do. And he adds² 'At least we have kept "Church," which they have not. . . . We go to church, and they to chapel.'

This is not very convincing as an argument; but an earlier passage betrays more clearly the cowed condition of the writer's mind:—'The matter is reduced to a question of opposite probabilities, whether we shall suppose active communion dispensable, or shall proceed

¹ p. 72.

² p. 75.

utterly to extinguish the candlesticks of an old and famous Christian country, dear to Christendom. Well were it if they would look back upon the past, and show us some little love for the Fathers' sake. Would that both parties would look back on that ancient time which they both claim as theirs, and would love each other in it! Would that our Fathers could plead somewhat for us in their affections, and bring them to relent from the cruel purpose with which they follow after us to destroy us.¹

This reads like the words of a man who knows that he is beaten, and yet desires to defer the day of surrender as long as possible. But he rouses himself again from his depression, and declares that the claim of Rome herself to the note of intercommunion is, in relation to England and Russia, little more than a legal fiction. And then Newman makes his final stand on the note of Sanctity:—‘At all times, since Christianity came into the world, an open contest has been going on between religion and irreligion, and the true Church, of course, has ever been on the religious side. This then is a sure test in every age, *where* the Christian should stand. There may have been corruptions or errors, and great difficulties of judgement about details; but in spite of them all, he would feel no hesitation, did he live in the eleventh century, that Hildebrand was the champion of heaven, not Caesar; in the twelfth, Becket, not Henry. Now applying this simple criterion to the public parties of this day, it is very plain that the English Church is at present on God's side, and therefore so far God's Church;—We are sorry to be obliged to add that there is as little doubt on which side English Romanism is. It must be

¹ p. 73.

a very galling thought to serious minds who profess it to feel that they are standing with the enemies of God, co-operating with the haters of truth and haters of the light, and thereby prejudicing religious minds even against those verities which Rome continues to hold.' ¹

Newman then proceeds to give instances from the history of the Church to show that as a matter of fact, in certain circumstances, and in the case of certain individuals, the being technically in schism did not 'unchurch' men of known piety and goodness. Very many of those who were Semi-Arians were spoken of with affection and veneration by orthodox Saints; Meletius of Antioch and Lucifer of Cagliari were, for different reasons, not in communion with the majority of the Church; yet they were generally respected by their contemporaries, and even spoken of as saints by eminent orthodox prelates; and 'the Church of Rome has canonised persons who have lived and died in communion with an anti-Pope, on the plea of involuntary ignorance.' 'Now ² what do all these instances show but this, that in troubled times of the Church much allowance ought to be made on all hands for jealousies, misunderstandings, estrangements between the parts of the Church, and that it is a very serious matter for any individual to pronounce, what perhaps the whole Church alone can undertake, that this or that part of itself is in formal and fatal schism. Nor are we aware, taking Romanists on their own principles, that their Church has ever given such a sentence against ours.' He then proceeds ³—'Much as Roman Catholics may denounce us at present as schismatical, they could not resist us, if the Anglican communion had but that one note of the Church upon it, to which all these instances point—Sanctity.'

¹ p. 79.

² p. 85.

³ p. 86.

The notes of the Church stand for ideals to be reached after. But any individual group of human beings which claims to have attained to holiness is, by that very pretension, self-condemned as a serious defaulter. So Newman continues in words which each generation of Churchmen must make their own:—‘ Unless our system really has a power in it, making us neglectful of wealth, neglectful of station, neglectful of ease, munificent, austere, reverent, child-like, unless it is able to bring our passions into order, to make us pure, to make us meek, to rule our intellect, to give government of speech, to inspire firmness and to destroy self, we do not deserve to be acknowledged as a Church, and we submit to be ill-treated. ’ ¹

This is admirably put; but of course it is in the prophetic style of writing. The Church militant here in earth will never wholly consist of saints such as are here described. What is wrong with Rome is not failure consistently to attain to lofty ideals, but systematic toleration of low ideals; and so Newman proceeds.²

‘ And, on the other hand, we put the matter on the same issue as regards themselves. . . . Till we see in them as a Church, more straightforwardness, truth, and openness, more of severe obedience to God’s least commandments, more scrupulousness about means, less of a political, scheming, grasping spirit, less of intrigue, less that looks hollow and superficial, less accommodation to the tastes of the vulgar, less subservience to the vices of the rich, less humoring of men’s morbid and wayward imaginations, less indulgence of their low and carnal superstition, less intimacy with the revolutionary spirit of the day, we will keep aloof from them as we do..

¹ p. 87.

² p 87

In perplexed times such as these, when the landmarks of truth are torn up or buried, here is a sure guide providentially given us, which we cannot be wrong in following, "By their fruits ye shall know them." When we go into foreign countries we see superstitions in the Roman Church which shock us; when we read history, we find its spirit of intrigue so rife, so general, that "Jesuitism" has become a bye-word; when we look round us at home, we see it associated everywhere with the low democracy, pandering to the spirit of rebellion, the lust of change, the unthankfulness of the irreligious and the enviousness of the needy. We see its grave theologians connecting their names with men who are convicted by the common sense of mankind of something very like perjury, and its leaders in alliance with a political party notorious in the *orbis terrarum* as a sort of standard in every place for liberalism and infidelity. We see it attempting to gain converts among us, by unreal representations of its doctrines, plausible statements, bold assertions, appeals to the weaknesses of human nature, to our fancies, our eccentricities, our fears, our frivolities, our false philosophies. We see its agents smiling and nodding and ducking to attract attention, as gipsies make up to truant boys, holding out tales for the nursery, and pretty pictures, and gold ginger-bread, and physic concealed in jam, and sugarplums for good children. Who can but feel shame when the religion of Ximenes, Boromeo and Pascal is so overlaid? Who can but feel sorrow when its devout and earnest defenders so mistake its genius and our capabilities? We Englishmen like manliness, openness, consistency, truth. Rome will never gain on us till she learns these virtues and uses them; then she may gain us, but it will be by ceasing to be what we now mean by Rome, by having a

right, not to "have dominion over our faith", but to gain and possess our affections in the bonds of the Gospel.'

It is right to add that this is followed by some sentences couched in a more conciliatory tone than in this grave impeachment of Roman morals.

CHAPTER VII

TRACT No. 90

IN the year 1840, Newman began to reside at Littlemore, an outlying district of his parish of St. Mary's. He had, in 1836, built there a chapel of ease, and subsequently a residence ; and now he acquired nine acres of land on which he intended to build a monastic establishment of a modest nature : a library with ' cells ' attached, each ' cell ' to contain three rooms : sitting-room, bedroom, and a cold-bath-room : the ' cells ' to be added as required. He did not however retire to live entirely at Littlemore till 1842.

It is difficult not to see in this a deliberate preparation of a place of retirement from the ministry of the Church. In fact, in a letter to his sister Jemima, of May 28, he says, ' This may lead ultimately to my resigning my Fellowship ; but these are visions as yet.'¹ One reason in favour of resignation which had, a little later (November 25, 1840), most weight with him was his consciousness of ' the tendency of his opinions to create Roman sympathies.'²

He consulted Keble on this matter ; and Keble ' did not think it a reason *necessitating* resignation.' It had come to this : would the scandal and misunderstanding caused by resignation do more harm to the Church than the retention of office in the Anglican communion by a person who was in fact, if not in intention, a source of strength to Rome ? At this moment (November 25, 1840), Newman felt he ought to remain. For one thing,

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 305.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 318.

' Liberalism, Rationalism, is the foe at our doors . . . I am more certain that Protestantism leads to infidelity than that my own views lead to Rome.' A more compelling reason was his hope of being able to make his ecclesiastical environment conform to the requirements of his own mind :—' We don't know yet what the English Church will bear of infused Catholic truth. We are, as it were, proving cannon. I know that there is a danger of bursting ; but still, one has no right to assume that our Church will not stand the test.' The test was applied in March, 1841 ; there was a tremendous explosion ; some persons were hurt ; but it was not the English Church that burst.

As far back as March 28, 1831, Newman had had in contemplation a work on the Thirty-nine Articles of a comprehensive kind. And although such a work was never undertaken by him, the necessity for the formulation and adoption of a fresh and definite theory about their relation to the actually existing Church was always present to the minds of Newman and his friends, and made them more or less uncomfortable.

The Articles give the average reader the impression of being both lengthy and technical ; and in consequence of their having been used for many generations as an exclusive test, a test applied moreover to laymen as well as to clergymen, they had come to be regarded as an Anglican *Summa Theologica*, a compendium of Anglican belief, positive as well as negative. And this conception of them had come to be emphasized in the English Church to an extent altogether unwarranted by their origin and the first intention of those who framed them. The expositions of them, formal and informal, which were in current use naturally reflected the opinions of those in authority from time to time ; and the views of the

authorities when Newman began the 'Second reformation' of the Church were certainly not the views of the great Anglican divines of the seventeenth century, whose writings were the inspiration of the *Tracts for the Times*.

Now many of the doctrines revived by the Tractarians have a family likeness to doctrines held in the Church of Rome ; this was acknowledged ; and as the tone and temper of the Articles are, on the face of them, anti-Roman, it became a matter of urgent practical importance to prove that the Articles do not, in point of fact, exclude Anglo-Catholic teaching. This had been attempted, and in many cases with complete success, in the case of particular points of belief and practice, treated independently. Newman now presented an examination of all those Articles, the anti-Romanism of which had been commonly thought least open to question. What gave the shock to the Church-man-in-the-street was the concentration in one powerful pamphlet of anti-Protestant points which hitherto had been discussed one by one ; it was the effect of a broadside, pointblank discharge, in place of 'distant and random guns.'

The last and most famous of all the Tracts was published on February 27, 1841 ; it was entitled 'Remarks on Certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles.'

The Introduction to this Tract is a masterpiece of thought and style, setting forth the only way in which Unity can be attained : 'Religious changes, to be beneficial, should be the act of the whole body ; they are worth little if they are the mere act of a majority. No good can come of any change which is not heartfelt, a development of feelings springing up freely and calmly within the bosom of the whole body itself.' The whole

passage may be commended to the earnest consideration of those in our own day who, in their agitation for Unity, are beset, as Newman himself was, by the 'unbelief of restlessness.'

The writer then states the scope of the Tract, 'which is merely to show that, while our Prayer Book is acknowledged on all hands to be of Catholic origin, our Articles also, the offspring of an uncatholic age, are, through God's good providence, to say the least, not uncatholic, and may be subscribed by those who aim at being catholic in heart and doctrine.'

Then follow twelve sections in which topics dealt with in the Articles are examined. He treats the wording of each dogmatic statement as a lawyer might do, a lawyer whose mind had not been biassed by Bishop Burnet's Exposition.

The sections of the Tract are as follows :—

1. Holy Scripture and the Authority of the Church.
2. Justification by Faith only.
3. Works before and after Justification.
4. The Visible Church.
5. General Councils.
6. Purgatory, Pardons, Images, Relics, Invocation of Saints.
7. The Sacraments.
8. Transubstantiation.
9. Masses.
10. Marriage of Clergy.
11. The Homilies.
12. The Bishop of Rome.

I may say at once that the only sections to which reasonable exception can be taken are Nos. 5, 6, and 9. But while the general principles on which the re-examination of the Articles proceeds is eminently fair, and in

most cases the explanation suggested is true, yet the effect of the concentration in one pamphlet of so much dialectical ingenuity was distasteful to simple minds ; and the obvious special pleading exhibited in certain crucial cases, raised at the time—and still raises—a prejudice in many minds against the moderate arguments and conclusions of the *Tract*.

The irritation produced by Newman's re-handling of the Articles was not wholly due to the religious doctrine for which he sought toleration ; it arose in great measure from semi-political prejudice. Newman seemed to be attempting to provide a loophole for the admission to certain material privileges of those whom the constituted Authorities had for 300 years excluded by means of these same Articles.

At the time, Newman wrote to Dr. Jelf, 'The only peculiarity of the view I advocate, if I must so call it, is this—that, whereas it is usual at this day to make the *particular belief of their writers* the true interpretation, I would make the *belief of the Catholic Church such*.'¹ In a like spirit, he says in the 'Conclusion' of the *Tract*, 'It is a *duty* which we owe both to the Catholic Church and to our own, to take our reformed confessions in the most Catholic sense they will admit ; we have no duties towards their framers.'

This practical policy is supported by considerations such as these :—

'In giving the Articles a Catholic interpretation, we bring them into harmony with the Book of Common Prayer, an object of the most serious moment in those who have given their assent to both formularies.'

'The Declaration prefixed to the Articles . . . enjoins

¹ *Apologia*, p. 233.

ing the "literal and grammatical sense," relieves us from the necessity of making the known opinions of their framers a comment upon their text; and its forbidding any person to "affix any *new* sense to any Article," was promulgated at a time when the leading men of our Church were especially noted for those Catholic views which have been here advocated.'

Again, 'Such an interpretation is in accordance with the well-known general leaning of Melancthon, from whose writings our Articles are principally drawn.'

'Further: the Articles are evidently framed on the principle of leaving open large questions, on which the controversy hinges. They state broadly extreme truths, and are silent about their adjustment.'

'Lastly, their framers constructed them in such a way as best to comprehend those who did not go so far in Protestantism as themselves. Anglo-Catholics, then, are but the successors and representatives of those moderate reformers. . . . It follows that they are not perverting, they are using them, for an express purpose for which among others their authors framed them. . . . If, then, their framers have gained their side of the compact in effecting the reception of the Articles, the Catholics have theirs too in retaining their own Catholic interpretation of them.'

And he ends with these resolute words:—'The Protestant Confession was drawn up with the purpose of including Catholics; and Catholics now will not be excluded. What was an economy in the reformers, is a protection to us. What would have been a perplexity to us then, is a perplexity to Protestants now. We could not then have found fault with their words; they cannot now repudiate our meaning.'

In the *Apologia* ¹ Newman notes that by the term 'Roman doctrine' might be meant one of three things :—

1. 'The *Catholic teaching* of the early centuries,' which is common to Romanism and Anglicanism.

2. 'The *formal dogmas of Rome*, as contained in the later Councils, especially the Council of Trent.'

3. 'The *actual popular beliefs and usages* sanctioned by Rome.'

He maintained that in the Articles 'Roman doctrine' in the first sense was not condemned, but the 'dominant errors' of Rome (3) were; and that of the formal dogmas of Rome (2), some were condemned and some were not.

It cannot with truth be said that Newman's reasoning always brings conviction. Let us take a few examples :—

'Art. XXI, General Councils may . . . err.'

The intention of the Article, according to the usual Anglican view, is to deny the infallibility of General Councils. Gallicans, who denied Papal Infallibility, maintained that the seat of the Church's infallibility is a true General Council. Anglicans, on the other hand, while believing in the Holy Spirit's mission 'to guide the Church into all the truth,' hesitate to include the decrees of a General Council in the body of such final truth until the whole Church has, formally or informally, verified the Council's decision by an examination of Holy Scripture.

Here is Newman's comment :—'General Councils then may err, *unless* in any case it is promised, as a matter of express supernatural privilege, that they shall *not* err; a

¹ p. 159.

case which lies beyond the scope of this Article, or at any rate beside its determination. Such a promise, however, *does* exist, in cases when General Councils are not only gathered together according to "the commandment and will of princes" but *in the Name of Christ*, according to our Lord's promise.' . . . 'What those *conditions* are, which fulfil the notion of a gathering "in the name of Christ," in the case of a particular Council, it is not necessary here to determine.'

This is surely 'a lame and impotent conclusion.' By this method of arguing the Article means nothing.

Again, Article XXII declares that 'the Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, etc.'

Here Newman opens the discussion by saying, 'Not every doctrine on these matters is a fond thing, but the *Romish* doctrine. Accordingly, the *Primitive* doctrine is not condemned in it, unless, indeed, the Primitive doctrine be the Romish, which must not be supposed. Now there *was* a Primitive doctrine on all these points,—how far Catholic or universal, is a further question,—but still so widely received and so respectably supported, that it may well be entertained as a matter of opinion by a theologian now; this, then, whatever be its merits, is not condemned by this Article.'

It may safely be said that the average Anglican of Newman's day would not admit that any doctrine, of a positive nature, on these points had any claim to his deference. It would seem to him somewhat of a quibble to apply the term *purgatory* to any state or condition of the departed other than that pictured in Roman Catholic popular imagination, a state in which 'souls detained are aided by the prayers of the faithful, but

chiefly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar.'¹ Similarly, the average Anglican of 1841 associated *pardons* only with the traffic in indulgences which precipitated Luther's reformation; he was impatient of the nice distinctions of meaning permissible in the use of the words *worship* and *adore*; and he was intolerant of the *invocation*, in any sense, of any created being.

In dealing with the baffling subject of Article XXVIII, Newman begins by stating that 'What is here opposed as "Transubstantiation," is the shocking doctrine that "the body of Christ," as the Article goes on to express it, is *not* given, taken, and eaten, after an heavenly and spiritual manner, but is carnally pressed with the teeth, that It is a body or substance of a certain extension and bulk in space, and a certain figure and due disposition of parts, whereas we hold that the only substance such, is the bread which we see.'

His treatment of the so-called Black Rubric, at the end of the Communion Office, is marked by great subtlety of thought and expression. The statement in the Rubric that causes most difficulty is that 'the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, *and not here*.'

Newman treats this as a statement based on a certain philosophical theory of locality. 'That there is a real presence, Scripture asserts, and the Homilies, Catechism, and Communion Service confess; but the explanation before us adds, that it is philosophically impossible that it should be a particular kind of presence, a presence of which one can say "it is here," or which is "local." It states then a philosophical deduction; but to such deduction none of us have subscribed.

¹ Council of Trent, Sess. xxv.

We have professed in the words of the Canon: "That the Book of Prayer, etc., containeth in it *nothing contrary to the word of God.*" Now, a position like this may not be, and is not, "contrary to the word of God," and yet need not be true, e.g. we may accept St. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, as containing nothing contrary to Scripture, nay, as altogether most scriptural, and yet this would not hinder us from rejecting the account of the Phoenix—as contrary, not to God's word, but to matter of fact.'

We are now able to perceive that the framers of the Black Rubric erred in calling in the aid of a philosophy which takes account only of space in three dimensions. Spiritual activities and energies of whose existence we have experiential knowledge, are not limited by space as we conceive of it.

All this is quite true; and if Newman's manner of presenting the truth is marked by 'subtleties, and refinements, and scholastic trifling,' we must acknowledge the justice of his retort: 'Those who ask hard questions must put up with hard answers.'

Perhaps the most questionable part of Tract 90 is the section on *Masses*. Article XXXI says, 'The sacrifices of Masses, in which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.'

Newman maintained that 'here the sacrifice of the *Mass* is not spoken of; . . . but 'the sacrifices of *Masses*,' certain observances, for the most part private and solitary, which the 'writers of the Articles knew to have been in force in time past.'

This line of argument was not wholly new. It was first worked out in 1646 by Christopher Davenport, an English

Franciscan, commonly known as Franciscus à Sancta Clara, in his *Paraphrastica Explicatio Articulorum Confessionis Anglicanae*, republished by F. G. Lee, in 1865.

A considerable number of eminent Anglican theologians have come to accept Newman's interpretation of this Article. It is maintained, for example, in Bishop Gibson's *Exposition of the Articles*, which at present holds the field as a standard authority. But those who remain unconvinced are not without reasons for their point of view.

They would say, in the first place, that what the Council of Trent decrees in 1562 as to the nature and use of the sacrifice of the Mass is very like—to say the least—what Article XXXI, affirms in 1553 to have been 'commonly said' about the sacrifices of Masses. The Council's words are:—'The victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests who then offered Himself on the Cross, the manner alone of offering being different. . . . Wherefore, not only for the sins, punishments (*poenis*), satisfactions and other necessities of the faithful who are alive, but also for the dead in Christ who are not as yet fully purified, is it rightly offered.'¹ The Article reads like a crude epitome of the Council's subsequent teaching.

Those who differ from Newman on this point would say in explanation of the past tense in the Article ('was commonly said . . . were') that it reflects the easy optimism characteristic of persons in authority:—We have by Act of Parliament banned certain 'dangerous deceits;' therefore they may be considered as things of the past; just as 'the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.'

¹ Sess. xxii, c. 2.

Again, we must distinguish between the Roman *theory* of the Eucharistic sacrifice and the prevalent Roman *practice*. It would be out of place here to discuss the Roman theory, or to pronounce upon the adequacy, or otherwise, of the various views as to the nature and use of the Eucharist which are regarded as tenable in the Anglican communion. This blessed sacrament is a thing too wonderful for human thought or human language. Moreover, it is not for man to dogmatize as to what prayer under certain conditions can, or cannot effect.

But it is scarcely open to doubt that the common Roman practice of separating the act of sacrifice from the communion of the people was the abuse—as they deemed it—which the Reformers of the sixteenth century chiefly desired to exclude from the Church of England. The Eucharist has various aspects ; two of which may be expressed in the words *communion* and *sacrifice* respectively. Now, the medieval Church had given almost exclusive prominence to the sacrificial aspect, and the Mass had come to mean a service in which generally the priest alone communicated. Such celebrations are expressly regularized by the Council of Trent.¹ The reformed English liturgy, on the other hand, from the very first, absolutely forbids the Eucharist to be celebrated unless ‘ some ’ of the people ‘ communicate with the priest.’

The practices characteristic of the two Churches respectively are well expressed by Hooker. Writing in reference to the application of a sacramental test to persons who desired to clear themselves of the imputation of ‘ Popish opinions,’ he says, ‘ The law requireth

¹ Sess. xxii, c. 6.

at their hands that duty which in conscience doth touch them nearest, because the greatest difference between us and them is the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. . . . As therefore on our part to *hear Mass* were an open departure from that sincere profession wherein we stand, so if they on the other side *receive our communion*, they give us the strongest pledge of fidelity that man can demand.’¹

It may be added that although the wording of Article XXXI leaves much to be desired, the singular, *sacrifice*, could not be substituted for the plural, *sacrifices*, without resultant confusion of ideas. *Sacrifices* mean *acts of sacrifice*, in the performance of which the priest does, or is said to do, certain things. *The sacrifice of the Mass*, on the other hand, is an abstract term, meaning a particular doctrinal conception of the Eucharist. The priest cannot *do* anything *in* an abstraction.

There is extant a very interesting letter, from R. W. Church to F. Rogers, dated March 14 and 21, 1841, in which he describes the reception of the Tract in Oxford. Of the Tract itself he says that Newman ‘put out explicitly what of course many must have felt more or less for a long time.’ He then proceeds:—‘Newman must have the credit of having taken some pains to find out beforehand whether it was likely to make much row. He did not think it would be more attacked than others, nor did Keble or H. Wilberforce. Ward, however, prophesied from the first that it would be hotly received, and so it proved.’²

The first official move against the Tract came from four Senior Tutors, of whom one was Tait, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. They wrote a letter to the

¹ *E. P.* v. 68, 8.

² *Mozley*, ii, 329.

Editor of the Tracts protesting that the Tract 'had a tendency to mitigate, beyond what charity requires, and to the prejudice of the pure truth of the Gospel, the very serious differences which separate the Church of Rome from our own.' This was followed by action on the part of the Hebdomadal Board, consisting of the Heads of Houses in the University. In anticipation of their expected censure, Newman set about writing a pamphlet in explanation of his Tract. But while it was actually in the press, the Heads met and by a majority, 'resolved, That modes of interpretation such as suggested in the said Tract, evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors which they were designed to counteract, defeat the object and are inconsistent with the due observance of the . . . Statutes.'

Too much has been made of the haste with which the Heads acted, as well as of the 'calm and lofty meekness' with which Newman took their sentence. There is no doubt that whether we now agree with their sentence or not, the majority of the Heads of Oxford University simply expressed what was then the feeling of the great majority of the members of the Church of England. That feeling would have been expressed, and quickly too, in some other way, had they remained silent. And though Newman made an answer to the four Tutors, he made no retraction of his principles. He was probably acting for the public a part he could on occasion act in private. Describing his meeting Arnold at dinner in 1842¹ he says 'I was most absolutely cool, or rather calm and unconcerned, all through the meeting from beginning to end. . . . In such situations . . . I seem

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 440.

. . . to *put on* a very simple, innocent, and modest manner. I sometimes laugh at myself, and at the absurdities which result from it.'

In the case of Tract No. 90 Newman's meek demeanour secured him comparative peace at Oxford. It softened his own Bishop, who merely asked that Newman 'would undertake not to discuss the Articles any more in the Tracts.' Newman wrote back, offering to do anything the Bishop wished, suppress No. 90, or stop the Tracts, or give up St. Mary's; which brought back, 'a most kind letter . . . saying that ". . . Newman and his friends need fear nothing disagreeable or painful."' ¹

The immediate result was that Newman agreed to 'publish a letter to the Bishop at his wish, stating that he wishes the Tracts to be discontinued, and he thinks No. 90 objectionable as tending to disturb the Church.'²

The advantage thus remained with Newman, who writes thus to Keble on April 1:—'I think I have managed to wedge in a good many bits of Catholicism, which *now* come out with the Bishop's sanction. How odd it is that one should be *able* to act from the heart, yet from the head too; yet I think I have been honest—at least I hope so.'

In a second letter, written the same day, he advises Keble 'to let the matter drop at present. We have got the principle of our interpretation admitted, in that it has not been condemned. Do not let us provoke opposition. Numbers will be taking advantage silently and quietly of the admission for their own benefit. It will soon be *assumed* as a matter of course.'³

A similar anticipation of the ultimate issue was

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 332.

² Letter of March 30.

³ *Mozley*, ii, 341, 342.

expressed by Pusey in a letter to J. R. Hope, written about the same time :—

‘ The pseudo-traditionary and vague ultra-Protestant interpretation of the Articles has received a blow from which it will not recover. People will abuse Tract No. 90, and adopt its main principles.’¹ This prediction has been completely fulfilled.

On the other hand, Newman was not satisfied with the gain he saw in prospect. He had spoken of Tract No. 90, while it was in preparation as ‘ a hazardous experiment—like proving cannon.’ Looking back on the experiment, in 1864, he notes on the metaphor,² ‘ What was contemplated was the bursting of the *Catholicity* of the Anglican Church, that is, my *subjective idea* of that Church. Its bursting would not hurt her with the world, but would be a discovery that she was purely and essentially Protestant, and would be really the “hoisting of the engineer with his own petar.” And this was the result.’

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 344.

² *Apologia*, p. 239.

CHAPTER VIII

THE DEFEAT

THE term *Catholicity* is a very elastic word, as is *Protestantism* or *Liberalism* and all similar denominations. It has been said that Bulwer Lytton's novels can be dated by the age given to the several heroes of them; the author's own age always seemed to him the right age for a man to be. In like manner the connotation of *Catholicity* for Newman changed with the changes of his own mind. When he began what he called 'The second Reformation,' the Catholicity of the English Church meant the body of non-Puritan beliefs common to the great divines of the seventeenth century. But as regards a good many points in Tract No. 90, these divines would have agreed with the majority of the Heads of Houses, that Newman's interpretation of the Articles was an evasion. The Caroline divines gave no uncertain sound in their blasts against Rome. But the Caroline divines were now, in 1841, *vieux jeu*. Newman writes to Bowden on April 4, 'In order to kindle love of the National Church, and yet to inculcate a Catholic tone, nothing else is necessary but to take our Church in the Middle Ages.' He noted subsequently on this passage, 'This was the line taken by me immediately on feeling the force of Dr. Wiseman's article about the Donatists. It led me to publish "Lives of the English Saints."'¹

I may remark parenthetically that these *Lives* came out in 1844-45. Newman was for a short time only, the

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 345.

editor of the series¹ and contributed the lives of St. Bettelin (prose portion only), St. Edelwald and St. Gundleus. One of the contributors was James Anthony Froude, who took deacon's orders in 1844, as a condition of retaining his Fellowship. Newman entrusted him with the life of St. Neot; but St. Neot's miracles were more than Froude's faith could stand, and set him steadily in the direction of scepticism, which he openly avowed in 1849, in his *Nemesis of Faith*.

To resume the account of Newman's spiritual progress.—His extant correspondence for 1841, between April and September is very scant. In the *Apologia*² he says that between July and November 'I received three blows which broke me.'

1. The first was the impression made on him by a fresh study of the Arian controversy in connexion with his translation of the works of St. Athanasius for the Library of the Fathers. He says, 'The ghost had come a second time . . . I saw clearly, that in the history of Arianism, the pure Arians were the Protestants, the semi-Arians were the Anglicans, and that Rome now was what it was. The truth lay, not with the *Via Media*, but in what was called "the extreme party."'

2. The second blow was the public condemnation of his views by the spiritual authorities of the Church of England. The Bishops, one after another, denounced him in their visitation charges. Newman protested that this action on their part was unfair, as there had been, he alleged, an 'understanding' that if he published no more Tracts the Bishops would not condemn No. 90.

¹ Newman suggested the series; but he ceased to be editor after the first two *Lives* (*St. Stephen Harding*, by Dalgairn, and *The Family of S. Richard*, by T. Meyrick) were published. Newman's three contributions appeared in 1844.

² p. 243.

It is, of course, true that his own bishop had given him some such assurance ; and that this had been approved of by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of London and Lincoln. But their informal action could not possibly bind the other bishops ; and if any bishop believed—as most of them did believe—that anti-Protestant teaching involved disloyalty to the Church of England, he could not keep silence, consistently with his plain duty to his flock.

3. The third blow was ‘ the affair of the Jerusalem Bishopric. ’

This is an instructive episode in the history of the application to the Church of the principles of Erastianism. The Prussian government, having forced the Lutherans and Calvinists in the Kingdom of Prussia into one so-called Evangelical Church, desired to bring them under the episcopal system. This had long been the dream of Frederick William IV, King of Prussia (1840–1861), elder brother of the Emperor William I who succeeded him on the throne of Prussia. He looked on England as the chief home of Protestant episcopacy ; and to England Frederick William sent his envoy, the Chevalier Bunsen, to arrange matters. Queen Victoria had married a German Prince in 1840 ; and naturally was disposed to oblige a German monarch. Accordingly, in October 1841, by an arrangement with the English government, a Protestant bishop was appointed in Jerusalem, to have jurisdiction over ‘ such Protestant congregations as may be desirous of placing themselves under his authority,’ but primarily over Anglicans. The King of Prussia hoped that if the Germans when in Jerusalem found no harm come to them from the ecclesiastical rule of a bishop—alternately English and German—, they might welcome episcopacy in Prussia

and the rest of Protestant Germany, when exercised by prelates of German blood; the episcopal orders would of course derive from England.

The terms of the Act of Parliament (October 5, 1841), constituting this new departure run thus :—‘ Such Bishop so consecrated may exercise, within such limits as may from time to time be assigned for that purpose in such foreign countries by Her Majesty, spiritual jurisdiction over the ministers of British congregations of the United Church of England and Ireland, and over such other Protestant congregations as may be desirous of placing themselves under his authority. ’

The significance of this transaction was that the serious differences in doctrine, as well as in constitution, between the Anglican communion and Prussian State Protestantism were declared to be negligible; and that by the official authorities of the English Church, at the bidding of the civil power. Newman observed that ‘ Lutherans were thus to be admitted to our communion without any renunciation of their errors, or regard to their due acceptance of baptism and confirmation, while there was great reason to suppose that the said Bishop was intended to make converts from the orthodox Greeks and the schismatical Oriental bodies by means of the influence of England. ’

The first Bishop, Michael Solomon Alexander, a converted German Jew, who, since 1832, had been Professor of Hebrew at King’s College, London, was consecrated at Lambeth, November 7, 1841.

Newman thought that he saw in the Jerusalem Bishopric project a good deal more than either a measure to unite Protestants in the East, or a means by which Lutherans might be brought under episcopacy. He feared it was also designed to react on England, and

draw the English Church into a close alliance with Continental Protestantism. Actuated by this fear, he sent, on November 11, a solemn protest to the Bishop of Oxford and the Archbishop of Canterbury against the proposed consecration of a Bishop in Jerusalem, the chief substance of which is as follows:—

‘Whereas the Church of England has a claim on the allegiance of Catholic believers only on the ground of her own claim to be considered a branch of the Catholic Church: . . .

And whereas Lutheranism and Calvinism are heresies, repugnant to Scripture, springing up three centuries since, and anathematized by East as well as West: . . .

I in my place, being a priest of the English Church and Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin’s, Oxford, by way of relieving my conscience, do hereby solemnly protest against the measure aforesaid, and disown it, as removing our Church from her present ground, and tending to her disorganization.’ ¹

Before sending this protest he explained his purpose and his fears to Keble and Bowden (November 13). To the latter he says:—‘It is quite plain that our rulers *can* unchurch us, and I have no assurance that there is not a great scheme afloat to unite us in a Protestant League—the limits of which no one can see. I do not wish this mentioned. I know well I shall be abused for this act, but if it hinders others going so far as they otherwise would, it will be something.’ ²

Keble ‘thought the Protest had better not be published;’ he did not think it ‘respectful’. Pusey, on the other hand, ‘is rather strong *for* its publication. He does not concur in that part which says that Lutheranism

¹ *Apologia*, pp. 251, 252.

² *Mozley*, ii, 361.

is a heresy, but he thinks that a very strong step now *may* stop matters.' ¹

Shortly before this (October 17) in a letter to J. R. Hope, Newman said, 'I think . . . that we must be very much on our guard against what Cowper calls "desperate steps"'. . .

Beware of desperate steps. The darkest day,
Live till to-morrow, will have passed away.

'I cannot deny that a great and anxious *experiment* is going on, whether our Church be or be not Catholic; the issue may not be in our day. But I must be plain in saying that, if it does issue in Protestantism, I shall think it my duty, if alive, to leave it. . . . I am beginning to think that the only way to keep in the English Church is steadily to contemplate and act upon the possibility of leaving it.' ²

The subsequent history of the Jerusalem Bishopric is an exemplification of the perennial delusion as to the stability or utility of 'a slight wall daubed with untempered mortar.' ³ The attempt to conciliate one's adversaries by betraying one's friends is a futility which always ends in humiliation. Only two Germans were ever ordained under the scheme. On their return to Germany their ordination was not acknowledged by the Prussian Evangelical Church, and pastorates could not be found for them. The Jerusalem scheme gratified the imaginations of those members of the English Church who dislike its Catholic foundations. It may have precipitated Newman's secession; but that was inevitable long before M. Bunsen came to England. In 1881, the scheme came to an end with the death of the third

¹ Letter to Keble, November 17, 1841, *Mozley*, ii, 365.

² *Mozley*, ii, 356.

³ Ezek. xiii. 10.

Bishop. The compact on this matter between England and Germany was formally dissolved in 1886; and a purely Anglican Bishop was appointed in 1887.

The Jerusalem Bishopric affair finally shattered Newman's faith in the Catholicity of the English Church. But even then, he could not summon up sufficient resolution to leave it.

About this time the Professorship of Poetry at Oxford became vacant through the ending of Keble's term of office; and the election of his successor by the Convocation of the university was turned into a trial of party strength between the Tractarians and the Evangelicals. Isaac Williams, one of the candidates, was a genuine, if a minor, poet. He was one of the contributors to the *Lyra Apostolica*, and his translations of hymns from the Paris Breviary made a powerful impression on such men as Neale, and gave a stimulus to work in kindred fields. The hymn, 'Lord, in this thy mercy's day' is his. He was, however, prominent in the Tractarian movement; he was Newman's curate, and the author of three of the Tracts, 80, 86, 87. The title of Tract No. 80, on *Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge*, was in itself a challenge to Protestant suspicion.

The Low Church party seized on William's candidature as a welcome opportunity of giving a public rebuff to Newman and his friends. The condemnation of Tract No. 90 by the hostile Heads of Houses had not covered them with glory, even in the eyes of their friends; it had been managed badly. So they now put up, in opposition to Williams, one James Garbett, who was a good classical scholar and a champion of Evangelicalism, but with no pretensions to being either a poet or a competent critic of poetry. His lectures on the subject were written in very elegant Latin. He afterwards became Archdeacon

of Chichester ; but it is probable that he owes his inclusion in the *Dictionary of National Biography* to the fact that the Evangelicals used him as a flag-pole on this occasion.

Newman, in a letter of November 21, 1841, says, I have been against his [William's] standing throughout from great dread of Convocation.¹ He knew well enough that his opponents were in the majority in that body of Masters of Arts, mostly clergymen ; and he feared that if they realized their strength and power to strike, they would use it in other ways directly ecclesiastical. Nevertheless, Williams might have been elected had not Pusey issued a most injudicious circular, complaining that Williams was being opposed on account of his Church principles. This determined many to vote against him who otherwise would have allowed the question to be decided from the point of view of poetry.

Williams desired to withdraw ; but before he had done so, it was agreed to ascertain informally what the voting would be. It was found that Garbett had 921 supporters, and Williams 623. This was the first defeat of the Tractarians as a party.²

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 367.

² See Church, *Oxford Movement*, pp. 271-6.

CHAPTER IX

1841-1845

‘FROM the end of 1841,’ Newman says,¹ ‘I was on my deathbed, as regards my membership with the Anglican Church, though at the time I became aware of it only by degrees.’

To others, however, the impending change was seen as inevitable; and many thought that he was ‘an unconscionable time in dying.’ On Christmas Day, 1841, he wrote to R. W. Church:—‘Should not M. and the like see that it is unwise, unfair, and impatient to ask others what will you do under circumstances which have not, which may never come? Why bring fear, suspicion and dissension into the camp about things which are merely *in posse*? . . . I speak most sincerely when I say that there are things which I neither contemplate nor wish to contemplate, but when I am asked about them ten times, at length I begin to contemplate them. . . .

‘Is not this a time of strange providences? Is it not our safest course, without looking to consequences, to do simply *what we think right* day by day? Shall we not be sure to go wrong if we attempt to trace by anticipation the course of Divine Providence?’²

This is a prose expression of ‘I do not ask to see the distant scene,—one step enough for me.’

What held him back at this time from taking the final and decisive step was the fact that Rome ‘suffered honour to be paid to the Blessed Virgin and the saints

¹ *Apologia*, p. 257.

² *Mozley*, ii, 377, 378.

which I thought incompatible with the Supreme, Incommunicable Glory of the One Infinite and Eternal.’¹

He was quite sincere in his reluctance to be disloyal to his reason ; but he was being driven on by a degenerated ideal of institutionalism which was mastering his personality ; a deteriorating mental affection which impaired his sense of proportion, and made all notes of the Church, save that of Unity, seem of secondary importance.

Newman’s approximations to Rome may be compared to the gradual rising of the tide, in which one sees the waves receding as often as they advance, though they advance more than they recede. In one of these backwashes, he again fell back on the note of Sanctity as on—if we may vary the metaphor—a last line of defence against the Roman push within his own imagination. If the Church of England possessed that note, she might still be a Church, though she had lost the notes of Unity and Catholicity ; if she was not Jerusalem, she might be Samaria. ‘I am content,’ he wrote, ‘to be with Moses in the desert, or with Elijah excommunicated from the Temple.’² But this was a position on which it was impossible that ‘the unbelief of restlessness and fear’ could make a stand.

Meantime he did something in the way of making entrenchments in the rear. On January 19, 1842, he writes to his sister, Mrs. J. Mozley, ‘You may think that I have no *intention* of leaving St. Mary’s by the fact of my having taken a *lease* of the cottages at Littlemore, and having laid out a large sum of money on them ; but it is quite certain that an Archbishop’s letter, admitted by my own Bishop, might be of a nature to drive me away.’³

¹ *Apologia*, p. 258.

² *Ibid.*, p. 269.

³ *Mozley*, ii. 385.

The first definite, visible step towards his resignation of St. Mary's was taken early in February, 1842, when he went to reside in Littlemore 'for good,' stopping in Oxford only on Saturday evening and Sunday morning. In a letter of February 6, announcing this move, he says, characteristically, 'It makes me very downcast ; it is such a nuisance taking steps.'¹

He was beginning to feel 'out of place at Oxford ;' the Heads of Houses were 'taking measures to keep the men from St. Mary's ;' and Newman was minded 'to anticipate them by leaving off preaching' there. He had had thoughts of offering to resign both his Fellowship and St. Mary's, if he could have kept Littlemore. But it is doubtful if the division of the parish would then have been feasible.

On April 12, 1842, the Bishop of Oxford wrote to Newman, asking for an explanation of the purpose of the buildings in course of erection at Littlemore ; they had been described in the newspapers as 'a so-called Anglo-Catholic Monastery.'

Newman, not unnaturally, resented the interference of the newspapers with his private affairs ; and in reply to the Bishop, assured him that he was 'attempting nothing ecclesiastical, but something personal and private. . . . With the . . . view of personal improvement I was led . . . seriously to a design which had been long on my mind. For many years, at least thirteen, I have wished to give myself to a life of greater religious regularity than I have hitherto led.'²

Newman notes that the first night that he slept in the new house was April 19, 1842 ; and the last was Quinquagesima, February 22, 1846. On both occasions he was altogether alone.

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 386.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 392, 393.

One of the most interesting of the letters of this year is one addressed to the Venerable W. R. Lyall, Archdeacon of Maidstone, and afterwards Dean of Canterbury. It is dated July 16, and deals with the question, What and where is the Catholic Church?:—"I consider that, according to the great Anglican theory, . . . the present state of the Church is like that of an empire breaking or broken up." [He then describes the condition of the Turkish Empire as regards the position of its subjects.]

'Our difficulties in faith and obedience are just those which a subject in a decaying empire has in matters of allegiance. We sometimes do not know what is of authority and what is not; who has credentials and who has not; when local authorities are exceeding their power and when they are not; how far old precedents must be modified in existing circumstances, how far not. . . . Under these circumstances, when we are asked, "Where is the Church?" I can but answer, "Where it *was*"—the Church only *is* while it is one, for it is individually as He who animates and informs it. It is under an eclipse or *in deliquio* now, or, as Bellarmine says of the tenth century, "Christ is asleep in the ship," and a curious collateral witness is found in the difficulty which the Roman Catholics themselves find in determining *where* the seat of infallibility is. The Church has authority only while all the members conspire together. In such strange circumstances . . . we can but do what we think will best *please* the Lord and Master of the Church. . . . We obey those that are set over us, first, because they *are* set over us; next, because at least the Apostolical Succession is preserved (which is like *de facto* rulers being of the blood royal); further, because they are the nearest representatives we can find of the whole

Church, and are to a very great extent her instruments. We consider the local Church the type and deputy of the whole.'¹

The next significant step was a public Retractation of all the harsh things he had written about the Church of Rome. In reference to this he writes to J. R. Hope, on January 25, 1843:—'My conscience goaded me some two months since to an act which comes into effect, I believe, in the *Conservative Journal* next Saturday—viz. to eat a few dirty words of mine.'² This Retractation is reprinted in *Via Media*, vol. ii, p. 428ff. It is a collection of anti-Roman 'declarations' as distinguished from arguments, e.g. 'At the time of the Council of Trent . . . the whole Roman Communion bound itself . . . to the cause of Antichrist.'

The concluding words of this Retractation afford an illuminating example of Newman's willingness to surrender himself to a system of dogma, even though it were Protestant dogma:—'If you ask me how an individual could venture, not simply to hold, but to publish such views of a communion so ancient, so wide-spreading, so fruitful in saints, I answer that I said to myself, "I am not speaking my own words, I am but following almost a *consensus* of the divines of my own Church. They have ever used the strongest language against Rome, even the most able and learned of them. I wish to throw myself into their system. While I say what they say, I am safe. Such views, too, are necessary for our position." Yet I have reason to fear still, that such language is to be ascribed, in no small measure, to an impetuous temper, a hope of approving myself to persons I respect, and a wish to repel the charge of

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 399 f.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 406.

Romanism.' This is a delightful specimen of the *fides carbonarii*.

About the same time he published his *University Sermons*, fifteen in number. They deal for the most part, directly or indirectly, with Faith and Reason and their mutual relations. It is significant that the last of the series, preached on the Feast of the Purification, B. V. M., 1843, is on Doctrinal Development, a subject which occupied his thoughts during the months before his secession.

An author's estimate of his own work is always interesting, even when it does not commend itself to others. Of this book Newman says, 'It will be the best, not the most perfect, book I have done. I mean there is more to develop in it, though it is imperfect. My "University Sermons" are the least theological book I have published.'¹

As time went on, and Newman's imagination asserted itself more and more over his reason, it is interesting to trace in his correspondence indications of that analysis and explanation of his mental processes which at a later date he formulated in the *Grammar of Assent*. Thus on March, 8, 1843, he writes to a lady enquirer, 'Religious truth is reached, not by reasoning, but by an inward perception. Anyone can reason; only disciplined, educated, formed minds can perceive.'²

On April 3, 1843, he writes to Bowden 'about a plan I have of editing in numbers *Saints of the British Isles* . . . I mean the work to be historical and devotional, but not controversial. Doctrinal questions need not enter. As to miracles, I think they may be treated as matters of faith—credible according to their evidence.'³

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 407.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 409.

³ *Ibid.*, ii, 412, 413.

This project was a reflection of the transfer of the ideal age of the English Church from the seventeenth century to the Middle Ages. As we have already seen, the faith of J. A. Froude made shipwreck on the miracles of St. Neot.

In the summer of this year, 1843, there came a blow to the most eminent of the Tractarian party which was not without its effect on Newman himself. A sermon, 'Catholic, not over strong,' preached by Pusey at Christ Church was formally impeached to the Vice-Chancellor; and, on the adverse report of six doctors in divinity, Pusey was suspended from preaching for two years. On this Newman comments¹:—'It is difficult to predict the ultimate effects. If his cause is taken up extensively it will damage the Heads. If not, it will tend to alienate still more from the Church persons of whose attachment to it there is already cause to be suspicious. It is one of those events which tend to bring matters to a crisis, without carrying with them any intimation on which side it will be decided.'

Towards the end of August there came another blow from the opposite direction; this time he 'was wounded in the house of his friends.' One of the inmates of his monastery at Littlemore, named Lockhart, left, and 'conformed to the Church of Rome.' In the letter in which Newman informs his sister of Mr. Lockhart's defection, he says, 'This occurrence will very likely fix the time of my resigning St. Mary's, for he has been teaching in our school till he went away. . . . I am not so zealous a defender of the established and existing system of religion as I ought to be for such a post.'²

He writes in a similar strain to J. B. Mozley,

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 414.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 418.

September 1, 1843, in a letter marked *confidential* :—‘ The truth then is, I am not a good son enough of the Church of England to feel I can in conscience hold preferment under her. I love the Church of Rome too well. ’¹

In his ‘ Chronological Notes ’ for September 1843 are these entries :—

September 17 :—Preached in the afternoon at St. Mary’s.

September 18 :—Had no sleep last night ; went to town . . . to Doctor’s Commons ; resigned St. Mary’s before a Notary.

September 24 :—Preached at St. Mary’s.

September 25 :—Littlemore Commemoration ; Pusey administered Sacrament. . . . I preached No. 604, my last sermon.²

Referring to this step in the *Apologia* ³ he remarks characteristically ‘ Then I myself was simply my own concern. ’

From this time on, Newman’s correspondence is much occupied with explanations as to why he did not at once produce the catastrophe of his soul’s tragedy. On September 22, he writes to his sister, ‘ You cannot estimate what so many (alas !) feel at present, the strange effect produced on the mind when the conviction flashes, or rather pours, in upon it that Rome is the true Church. Of course it is a most revolutionary, and therefore a most exciting, tumultuous conviction. For this reason persons should not act under it, for it is impossible in such a state of emotion that they can tell whether their conviction is well founded or not. They cannot judge calmly. ’ ⁴

¹ *Mozley*, ii. 423.

² p. 346.

³ *Ibid.*, ii, 424.

⁴ *Mozley* ii 424

On September 29, he wrote to his other sister, Mrs. Thomas Mozley, to say that he 'thought it *safer*, as a matter of honesty, *not* to keep his living.' He goes on:—'This is a very different thing from having any *intention* of joining the Church of Rome. However, to avow generally as much as I have said, would be wrong for ten thousand reasons. People cannot understand a man being in a state of *doubt*, of *misgiving*, of being unequal to *responsibilities*, etc.; but they will conclude that he has clear views either one way or the other. All I know is, that I could not without hypocrisy profess myself any longer a *teacher* and a *champion* for our Church.' ¹

On November 24, writing to J. B. Mozley, and referring to the blow of the summer of 1839, he says that his article of January 1840, on *The Catholicity of the English Church*, in which he replied to Wiseman, 'had the effect of quieting me for two years.' 'Since this time two years the feeling [that we are external to the Catholic Church] has revived and gradually strengthened. I have all along gone against it and think I ought to do so still. I am now publishing sermons, which speak more confidently about our position than I inwardly feel. But I think it right and do not care for seeming inconsistent.' ² He had on an earlier occasion said, 'Consistency is one of the properties of an inspired teacher, and none but him.' ³

On May 21, 1844, he writes to Mrs. J. Mozley, to assure her that he would not take her by surprise:—'But if I judge of the future by the past, and when I recollect the long time, now nearly five years, that certain views and feelings have been more or less familiar to me, and

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 425, 426.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 430.

³ *Ibid.*, ii, 35.

sometimes pressing on me, it would seem as if anything might happen. And I must confess that they are very much clearer and stronger than they were even a year ago. I can no more calculate how soon they may affect my will and become practical, than a person who has long had a bodily ailment on him (though I hope and trust that it is not an ailment) can tell when it may assume some critical shape, though it may do so any day.' ¹

On June 3, 1844, he intimated to Mrs. J. Mozley that he might give up his Fellowship. ²

Among the many proofs that 'his lovers stood looking upon his trouble' with agonized sympathy, we may quote from a letter of Keble's written on June 12, 1844. 'Do you not think it possible . . . that the whole Church may be so lowered by sin as to hinder one's finding on earth anything which seems really to answer to the Church of the Saints? and will it not be well to prepare yourself for disappointment, lest you fall into something like scepticism? You know I have always fancied that perhaps you were over-sanguine in making things square, and did not quite allow enough for Bishop Butler's notion of doubt and intellectual difficulty being some men's intended element and appropriate trial.' ³

This was not the first time that Keble had deprecated his friend's impetuosity. Ten years earlier (April 1, 1834) he had written, 'It never *can* be necessary for the Church that men should do grave things in a hurry—can it?' ⁴

The following extracts from letters to his sister,

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 431, 432.

³ *Ibid.*, ii, 433.

² *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, ii, 33.

Mrs. J. Mozley, indicate the poignancy of the soul agony through which he was now passing :—

24 November, 1844.

‘ I cannot make out that I have any motive but a sense of indefinite risk to my soul in remaining where I am. A clear conviction of the substantial identity of Christianity and the Roman system has now been on my mind for a full three years. It is more than five years since the conviction first came on me, though I struggled against it and overcame it. I believe all my feelings and wishes are against change. I have nothing to draw me elsewhere. I hardly ever was at a Roman service ; even abroad I knew no Roman Catholics. I have no sympathies with them as a party. I am giving up everything. I am not conscious of any resentment, disgust, or the like, to repel me from my present position ; and I have no dreams whatever—far from it indeed. I seem to be throwing myself away. ’¹

22 December, 1844.

‘ My motive simply is that I believe the Roman Church to be true, and that I have come to this belief without any assignable fault on my part. . . . Were I sure that it was without fault absolutely, I should not hesitate to move to-morrow. It is the fear that there is some secret undetected fault which is the cause of my belief which keeps me where I am, waiting. . . . In saying this I am not saying that another is wrong who does not do the same. I am only looking at myself. If God gives me certain light, supposing it to be such, this is a reason for *me* to act ; yet in so doing I am not condemning those who do not so act. ’²

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 445.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 451, 452.

15 March, 1845.

'As to my convictions, I can but say what I have told you already, that I cannot at all make out *why* I should determine on moving; except as thinking I should offend God by not doing so. I cannot make out what I am *at* except on this supposition. At my time of life men love ease. I love ease myself. I am giving up a maintenance involving no duties, and adequate to all my wants. What in the world am I doing this for (I ask *myself* this), except that I think I am called to do so? I am making a large income by my sermons. I am, to say the very least, risking this; the chance is that my sermons will have no further sale at all. I have a good name with many; I am deliberately sacrificing it. I have a bad name with more; I am fulfilling all their worst wishes, and giving them their ~~most~~ coveted triumph. I am distressing all I love, unsettling all I have instructed or aided. I am going to those whom I do not know, and of whom I expect very little. I am making myself an outcast, and that at my age. Oh, what can it be but a stern necessity which causes this?'¹

Not long after the date of the last extract, Newman wrote to J. B. Mozley, on April 2, 1845, 'I cannot promise myself to remain as I am after Christmas, perhaps not so long, though I suppose in the event, I shall linger on some little while longer. By November I expect to have resigned my Fellowship and perhaps may publish something.'²

The last clause refers to the *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, on which he had been engaged for some months. He resigned his Fellowship on October 3, on the 8th of that month, Father Dominic

¹ Mozley, ii, 459.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 464, 465.

the Passionist slept at Newman's house at Littlemore, and on the following day received his host into what both 'believed to be the One Fold of the Redeemer ;' both alike fatally blind to the grand truth that the Great Shepherd has his 'one flock' in many folds.

In answer to the charge that he had been 'a concealed Romanist' for ten years previous to his actual reception into the Roman Communion, Newman made the following statement in 1849 :—

1. For the first four years of the ten (up to Michaelmas, 1839) I honestly wished to benefit the Church of England, at the expense of the Church of Rome :

2. For the second four years, I wished to benefit the Church of England without prejudice to the Church of Rome :

3. At the beginning of the ninth year (Michaelmas, 1843) I began to despair of the Church of England, and gave up all clerical duty ; and then, what I wrote and did was influenced by a mere wish not to injure it, and not by the wish to benefit it :

4. At the beginning of the tenth year I distinctly contemplated leaving it, but I also distinctly told my friends that it was in my contemplation.

Lastly, during the last half of the tenth year, I was engaged in writing a book (*Essay on Development*) in favour of the Roman Church, and indirectly against the English ; but even then, till it was finished, I had not absolutely intended to publish it, wishing to reserve to myself the chance of changing my mind when the argumentative views which were actuating me had been distinctly brought out before me in writing.¹

¹ *Apologia*, p. 306.

It must be noted that the resolution to write the *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* had been formed in 1844.

The phrase *concealed Romanist* connotes insincerity, and a desire to mislead other people. Of this Newman must be acquitted. The moral flaw in him was not insincerity, but self-centredness, expressing itself through a very subtle intellect which yet, in spite of its subtlety, or perhaps as a consequence of it, was afflicted with a mental astigmatism. And this congenital feature of his personality, which would have characterized him in any age, was stimulated in a particular direction by his natural bias in favour of institutionalism in the issues involved in the religious controversies of his time.

Although Newman was a master in the use of irony, he had little sense of humour—fanaticism of any kind is antipathetic to humour—yet he was able to enjoy the following parabolic account of his own conduct during the period 1843-45, given by a lady who was in agreement with his opinions, but who was not personally known to him. He introduces it thus in the *Apologia* :—

‘ In a . . . vision of pilgrims, who were making their way across a bleak common in great discomfort, and who were ever warned against, yet continually nearing “ the king’s highway ” on the right, she says, “ All my fears and disquiets were speedily renewed by seeing the most daring of our leaders (the same who had first forced his way through the palisade, and in whose courage and sagacity we all put implicit trust), suddenly stop short, and declare that he would go on no further. He did not, however, take the leap at once, but quietly sat down on the top of the fence with his feet hanging towards the road, as if he meant to take his time about it, and let himself down easily.” ’

On this Newman makes the following illuminating comment:—‘My own soul was my first concern, and it seemed an absurdity to my reason to be converted in partnership.’¹

The same frank self-centredness, and that too swayed by ‘the unbelief of fear,’ terror of God, rather than fear of God—is expressed in a letter of January 8, 1845:—‘The simple question is, Can *I* (it is personal, not whether another, but can *I*) be saved in the English Church? Am *I* in safety, were I to die to-night? Is it a mortal sin in *me*, not joining another Communion?’²

¹ p. 348f.

² *Apologia*, p. 363.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

Securus judicat orbis terrarum. This maxim of the great African Father, the force of which Newman felt to be a crushing blow to his hopes for Anglo-Catholicism, may fairly be applied when we are gauging the value of his own output as a thinker and writer. His personality was fascinating in the strict sense of the term; and this fascination has affected the judgement of such of his critics as came into actual contact with him, or have inherited the feelings of those who were so privileged.

In the number of such must be included the late Mr. Wilfrid Ward, who, in his brilliant *Last Lectures*, has written at great length, and in language not unworthy of the great stylist for whose fame he is jealous, to prove that Newman was not only 'multifarious,' but a worker of the first rank in fields in which his performances are commonly ignored by those to whose judgement most people defer. Newman's multifariousness is not open to question. 'He is at once a religious leader a preacher, a father confessor, a religious philosopher, an historian, a theologian, and a poet—even a novelist.'¹ But, after all, in the case of a writer whose work was not done in a corner, one can put in evidence for his claim to a place among famous men only that which he has in fact achieved, not what he might have achieved had circumstances been other than they were.' The non-development, from any cause, of a man's potentialities

¹ *Last Lectures*, p. 6.

is, to mortals, a matter of wonder and grief ; God may look at it from another point of view :

All I could never be,
All, men ignored in me,
This, I was worth to God, whose wheel the pitcher shaped.

But the world has long ago made up its mind about Newman's place in literature ; and while such special pleading as that of Mr. Wilfrid Ward, may provide, as in this case, an intellectual treat, it will never make men accept Newman as an authority on Church history, much less as a great religious philosopher.

There is a homely proverb which reminds us that we cannot eat our cake and have it ; and it would be a grievously false accusation against Newman to suppose that he would have resented the verdict of the *orbis terrarum* on the work of his life. He deliberately undertook one task, and one only—'this one thing I do'—and by general consent, he succeeded in it as few have done. The work of his life was the defence of organized religion. He was by his own choice a polemic ; perhaps one of the most successful, certainly one of the most disinterested, that ever lived. Every man, according to the French saying, has the defects of his qualities ; and similarly each occupation, profession or rôle in life imposes limitations of its own on those who pursue it ; few are able occasionally to detach themselves from the atmosphere in which they habitually work : Newman certainly could not do so ; he never lets us forget that he was a Christian controversialist.

Now, in the first place, in the present state of the public mind—a phase which will probably continue for a considerable time—the fabric of organized religion does not interest all men ; discussions about it make

even some good Christians impatient. Again, the intrusion of polemics of any kind imparts a peculiar flavour which prevents literature affected by it from keeping sweet; and which, even when the literature is fresh from the maker, renders it distasteful to many. This is especially true of religious polemics. Newman will always be remembered as a great religious leader and preacher. His powers as a controversialist were exerted in a worthy cause, the greatness of which is the measure of his greatness. As he was not by any means the originator of the Oxford Movement, so neither was he the sole agent in its activities. In one of his letters (July, 1835) he says: 'A flame seems arising in so many places as to show no mortal incendiary is at work.'¹ Of all the flames kindled by this supernatural Incendiary Newman was the brightest and hottest, but not the most steady. His disappearance in 1845 may have seemed at the time a sign that the fire was going out; but in the event it made little difference: one more proof that there is no such thing as an indispensable man.

Here, however, we are concerned not with his failure, but with what he succeeded in doing; and in this respect our estimate of his work depends on our view of the significance for mankind of the manifold activities *quorum pars magna fuit*. It is, perhaps, not too much to say that the movement in which Newman was engaged transformed the Church of England into the Anglican Communion, gave it room to grow, set free latent powers, made men recognize as a world-wide spiritual force what they had thought of as a provincial—almost parochial—institution.

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 112.

Conceptually, at least, the Anglican Communion is the centre of Christendom. Here is a body which holds fast to historic continuity and the sacramental principle, and at the same time stretches out its hand to freedom of thought and the modern spirit. If ever the flock of Christ attains, here on earth, to a visible expression of its unity, it can only be by the adoption of principles suggested by the practical experience of Anglo-Catholicism. 'The vision is yet for the appointed time;' and though to us it does not seem to 'hasten towards the end,' yet 'it will surely come.' When it does come, the abiding value of Newman's work will be more generally recognized than is possible at present.

But the very fact that Newman was so great as a religious leader was in itself a bar to his achieving greatness as a religious philosopher. The very intensity of his concentration on the practical interests of the Church—as he conceived of them—unfitted him for engaging in that abstract speculation which is philosophy as we understand the term. It was not merely that he was confessedly ignorant of the writings of German and even of English metaphysicians, with the exception of Coleridge; his habits of thought were essentially not those of a philosopher. Even if he had been able to read German, the power would have done little more for him than enrich his already copious vocabulary.

One can say this, and yet admit that Newman had great powers of thought, and that he was an acute and subtle exponent of thought processes, of epistemology. But whatever, with his great intellect, he might have achieved, had he chosen to devote himself to philosophy, his will, in point of fact set his mind in an almost opposite direction.

The philosopher, as such, is a spiritual adventurer in search of truth. Like Ulysses, he 'cannot rest from travel;' he finds it hard to acquiesce in a revelation as a final statement of truth. On the other hand, the task that Newman set himself was the ascertainment and arranging of truths already given in revelation. He resented 'Coleridge's way of looking at the Church, sacraments, doctrines, etc., rather as symbols of a philosophy than as *truths*—as the mere accidental types of principles.'¹ Of the Cambridge men, who regarded Maurice as an oracle, he exclaims, 'What a set they are! They cannot make religion a reality; nothing more than a literature.'² Those words truly enough indicate the weakness of philosophy from the point of view of practical religion.

But the philosopher, as such, is not greatly concerned about the salvation of his own soul. His soul does not enter into his calculations save as a subject for analysis. Consideration of the salvation of his soul does not deter the philosopher from pursuing an attractive path of speculation. If he is a Christian, he 'commits his soul in well-doing unto a faithful Creator.' In any case, the speculations of the philosopher not unfrequently are seen to lead to the greater glory of God; and though his quest for truth is often bootless, those who have 'found God' benefit in the event, by the travel-experiences of those who are 'feeling after' Him.

In contrast to the philosopher's attitude towards the unseen, salvation, in the sense in which that word is used by simple Christians, was an absorbing interest and a controlling purpose in Newman's life.

¹ *Mozley*, ii, 156.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 275.

But although the claims put forward for Newman as a philosopher cannot be admitted, it is certainly true that the intensity of his own faith, kindling the imagination of his vigorous genius, enabled him to present to other men an account of Faith, as a faculty in man, more profound and more satisfying to the modern consciousness than anything available, up to that time, in English theology.

'Faith,' says Mr. Wilfrid Ward, 'is the *obscure* apprehension of a profound and comprehensive philosophy, while Rationalism is the *clear* apprehension of a narrow and shallow philosophy.'¹ Let us drop the term 'philosophy,' and say quite simply that Faith is the faculty in a person by which he maintains personal relationships with other persons. When the term is employed in reference to religion, Faith means the faculty whereby man recognizes his filial relationship to God, and maintains himself in that relationship. In a further stage, it means the faculty by which man hears and receives messages from his Father in heaven, or, in other words, apprehends and accepts the truths of revelation.

Rationalism, on the other hand, by eliminating God, as a Person, from the world, presents us with an impoverished conception of man. Deprived of his God-environment, his Godward faculties perish from inanition. In these circumstances reason can only be thought of as dealing with obviously material things.

Now, the great achievement of Newman was the establishment of the position of Faith as an intelligible principle in the nature of man; as a higher reason dealing with the things of God, though an 'obscure apprehension' because of the illimitable possibilities of the things with which it has to do.

¹ *Last Lectures*, p. 36.

Faith, like every other God-given element in man's nature, has always been fulfilling its purpose; but the unnaturalness of the explanations offered of it by orthodox theologians have sadly militated against its recognition as a real faculty by non-theologians. Notwithstanding the teaching of the mystics, the true naturalness of the personal relations of Man to God was obscured by the treatment of Faith as a special theological virtue, antagonistic to Reason; and at the same time, Reason was thought of as nothing more than the faculty which distinguishes truth from falsehood in philosophical and scientific investigations. Newman made it plain that an act of faith is an act of the whole personality. He wrote before the birth of scientific psychology; but though he did not know the term 'subliminal consciousness,' his University Sermons prove that his psychological insight anticipated many of the conclusions of recent research into the obscure depths of human personality.

As regards the apprehension of revealed truths, he was enabled to expand and give modern expression to St. Paul's great words, 'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness.'¹ The distinction drawn in Sermons 10 and 11 between 'implicit' and 'explicit' reasoning was a most important and original aid to our comprehension of the process by which men reach conclusions from the data set before them. This subject was more fully elaborated in the theory of the 'illative sense,' in the *Grammar of Assent*.

Of Newman's formal theological works, the most complete and satisfactory is the *Lectures on Justification*. He himself said of it on the eve of its publication, 'It is

¹ Rom. x. 10.

the first voyage I have yet made *proprio Marte*, with sun, stars, compass and a sounding line, but with very insufficient charts. It is a *terra incognita* in our Church, and I am so afraid not of saying things wrong so much as queer and crochety, and of misunderstanding other writers. For really the Lutherans, etc., as *divines*, are so shallow and inconsequent, that I can hardly believe my own impression about them.¹

To say that Justification was a *terra incognita* in the English Church may, perhaps, seem to some a paradoxical statement, seeing that no less than four of the Thirty-nine Articles deal with the subject. But it is true that until the publication of Newman's Lectures no serious attempt had been made by any Anglican theologian scientifically to formulate a theory of Justification comprehending the elements of truth both in the Lutheran Confessions and in the Decrees of the Council of Trent. Loyalty to Protestantism had been satisfied by an undefined and not very intelligent acquiescence in the theology of Melancthon; and the real inadequacy of the arid, logically complete definitions of the Tridentine *divines* had been felt rather than understood. The practical instinct of English Churchmen enabled them to 'muddle through' with the aid of the Church Catechism.

Justification means the whole process by which the individual man realizes his divine sonship. It is, in the spiritual sphere, analogous to the growth of a living organism to maturity, and has its beginning in God's calling a man by His grace, and its end on the day when the sons of God shall be revealed. It is the realization of a personal relationship, to the consummation of which many things are necessary: the act by which the child

¹ Letter of January 17, 1838, *Mozley*, ii, 249.

comes into existence, with its type stamped upon it from the outset ; the nourishment and training it receives, and its response, moral and physical, to the 'grace' ; above all, the response of love to love, the conformity of will to will. All the naturalness of this had been obscured by the legal and technical phraseology of Lutherans and Calvinists as well as of Romanists.

Furthermore, the Scriptural language on this, as on other matters, is not scientific and precise. Sometimes it expresses the optimism of God who 'declares the end from the beginning,' and 'calletth the things that are not, as though they were ;' while at other times it reflects the necessarily partial views of man. Man is apt to lay emphatic stress on some one of God's 'means' which he sees at the time to be neglected ; or again, man being of a matter-of-fact temperament, finds it hard to call anything by the name of that which it is not as yet.

Now Newman's *Lectures on Justification* did much to clear up a controversy in which, more than in any other, good men had been fighting over words and names rather than vital issues.

A great impetus was given to Patristic studies by the *Library of the Fathers*, of which Newman was editor, with Keble and Pusey, from 1836 till 1843. Besides some prefaces, which evince much historical acumen and scholarship, he contributed the translation of the writings of St. Athanasius against the Arians, an admirable piece of work. This series of translations was based on the Benedictine texts ; and no attempt was made to produce critical texts on scientific principles. This would have been, in most cases, impossible at that time. In every other respect these translations still remain the best available. So far as they extended, they fulfilled the

promise of the text cited on the title pages, 'Yet shall not thy teachers be removed into a corner any more, but thine eyes shall see thy teachers.'¹

It does not come within the scope of this book to discuss the *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*. It is an important contribution to the Roman controversy, from the Roman point of view. Although it was sent to the press a few days before Newman formally made his submission to Rome, he said plainly, in words already quoted, that it was written 'in favour of the Roman Church, and indirectly against the English.'

It is sufficient here to note that there is the greatest possible difference between a development of doctrine resulting from a gradual deepening apprehension by the Church of a revealed truth, and a development which is a progressive accretion in belief and practice, springing from misconceptions of a revealed truth. Apart from its literary merits, which are very great, and its usefulness to a Roman apologist, the *Essay* has a personal interest as a reflection of the last stage in the progress of Newman's 'ailment.' The book marks the surrender of his reason to his imagination.

'In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.' Had Newman, like Keble and Pusey and others, remained faithful to this their adopted watchword, the history of the Church of England in the nineteenth century would have been saddened by fewer soul-tragedies; but it might have been spiritually the poorer. Let us thank God for what He did give us of the days of the pilgrimage of John Henry Newman; for 'the half was more than the whole.'

¹ Isa. xxx. 20.

INDEX

A

Arians of the Fourth Century, 46

Arnold, Thomas, 16, 34, 93

B

Bagot, Richard. See Oxford, Bishop of

Bowden, J. W., 22, 23f, 36

British Critic, quoted, 5, 6, 7, 26, 32, 53f, 61ff, 70ff

British Magazine, 35, 38

Butler's *Analogy*, 28ff

C

Church, R. W., 11, 14, 38f, 44f, 92, 103

Church Missionary Society, 34f

Church Temporalities Act, 16, 37

Copeland, W. J., 41

Copleston, Edward, 31

Cyprian, St. His view of the episcopate, 71

D

Dalgairn, 97

Davenport, Christopher, 89f

Development of Doctrine, 60, 73, 109

Development, Essay on, 73, 115-117, 128

Dominic, Father, 115

E

'Economy', 46f

F

Froude, J. A., 32, 97, 110

Froude, R. H., 29, 31ff, 35, 36, 50

G

Garbett, James, 102f

Gibson, E. C. S., *Exposition of the Articles*, 90

Gladstone, W. E., 28

Grammar of Assent, 109, 125

H

Hampden, R. D., 49

Harrison, B., 41

Hawkins, Edward, 25, 31f, 35

Home Thoughts Abroad, 60

Hooker, Richard, quoted, 91f

Howley, William (Archbishop), 42

J

Jager, Abbé, 50

James, William, 27f

Jelf, R. W., 84

Jerusalem Bishopric, 98-102

Justification, Lectures on, 50, 125ff

K

Keble, John, 28-32, 36, 37, 66, 80, 92, 100, 102, 113, 127

Keble, Thomas, 61

Kingsley, Charles, 11

L

Letters on the Church, 26f
 Liberalism, 12, 17f, 34, 48, 81
Library of the Fathers, 50, 97, 127f
 Littlemore, 80, 105f, 110, 116
Lives of the English Saints, 96f, 109f
 Lockhart, William, 110
 Lyall, W. R., 107
Lyra Apostolica, 35f, 102

M

'Masses, Sacrifices of,' 89-92
 Mayer, Walter, 21
 Meyrick, T., 97
 Mozley, Anne, 10, 11, 19
 Mozley, John, 19
 Mozley, J. B., 19
 Mozley, Thomas, 19

N

Newman, Family of, 19
 Newman, Mary, 19, 31
 Nicholas, George, 19

O

O'Connell, Daniel, 68
 Oxford, Bishop of (Richard Bagot), 61, 94, 106

P

Palmer, William, 38-41
 Percival, A. P., 39, 70
 Poetry, Newman's, 36f
 'Popular Protestantism', 53ff
Prophetic Office of the Church, 50ff
 'Puritanism', 53f
 Pusey, E. B., 31, 43, 53, 66, 95, 100, 103, 110, 111, 127

R

Records of the Church, 43
 Retractation, Newman's, 108
 'Roman doctrine', 86
 Rose, H. J., 35, 38

S

Saints of the British Isles, 96f, 109f
 Salmon, George, quoted, 73
 Sermons, Newman's, 43-46, 109, 125
 Shairp, J. C., quoted, 44
 Spencer, George, 70
 Stanley, A. P., 65

T

Tait, A. C. (Archbishop), 92
Tracts for the Times, 39f

V

Via Media, 41, 51f, 55, 58, 63f, 67, 97

W

Ward, Wilfrid, 10, 11, 119f, 124
 Ward, W. G., 11, 39, 65, 92
 Whately, Richard (Archbishop), 26, 31
 Wilberforce, H. W., 66, 92
 Wilberforce, R. I., 31, 36
 Williams, Isaac, 36, 102f
 Williams, Robert, 65
 Wiseman, N. P. (Cardinal), 50ff, 65f, 96

PRINTED IN INDIA BY GEORGE KENNETH
AT THE DIOCESAN PRESS, VEPERY,
MADRAS—1925. C4357

Date Due

MAY 3 0 1975

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

21
48

119-
120-w

pg 128

taken

BX
4705.N5
W586
AUTHOR 56008
White, N.J.D.
TITLE
John Henry Newman

| DATE LOANED | BORROWER'S NAME | DATE RETURNED |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------|
|-------------|-----------------|---------------|

| | | |
|------|--------|-------|
| 10/3 | Brewer | 10-10 |
|------|--------|-------|

| | | |
|---------|--------|--|
| 1/17/38 | Brewer | |
|---------|--------|--|

| | | |
|------|-----------|--|
| 3/22 | R. Strain | |
|------|-----------|--|

| | | |
|--------|-------------|--|
| 2-4-42 | 14. Bentham | |
|--------|-------------|--|

| | | |
|----------|-------|--|
| 11-19-42 | Samek | |
|----------|-------|--|

| | | |
|------------|------|--|
| MAY 22 '75 | Wm C | |
|------------|------|--|

